DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 098 HE 022 976

AUTHOR	Bensimon, Estela Mara; And Others
TITLE	On Assuming a College or University Presidency: Lessons & Advice from the Field. Essays and a Resource Guide.
SPONS AGENCY	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY. College Retirement Equities Fund.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Board Administrator Relationship; *College Administration; *College Presidents; Governing Boards; Higher Education; *Leadership

ABSTRACT

Three essays and a resource guide are offered to assist new college and university presidents in contemplating their tasks, both the "big picture" and "daily detail." Estala Mara Bensimon's essay, titled "Five Approaches to Think About: Lessons Learned from Experienced Presidents," presents five recommendations, including making campus visits before assuming office, getting to know key players, reading university procedures, not looking for problems to solve, and getting involved in the budgetary process. "The President-Trustee Relationship, or What Every New President Should Know about the Board," by Marian Gade, focuses on the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the president during search and selection, what a president ought to be able to expect from the board, and what the president owes the board. "Strategies for an Effective Presidency," by Joseph Kauffman, outlines factors contributing to the success of college presidents, such as leadership, vision, stewardship, budget priorities, living on campus, working effectively with an inherited staff, and understanding the position's political aspects. The pamphlet concludes with a resource guide compiled by Sharon McDade, listing introductory programs for new presidents sponsored by higher education associations, leadership development programs, and over 100 publications. (JDD)

ON ASSUMING A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENCY

LESSONS & ADVICE FROM THE FIELD

Essays by

Estela Mara Bensimon

Marian L. Gade

Joseph F. Kauffman

On Assuming a College or University Presidency

Lessons & Advice From The Field

Essays by

Estela Mara Bensimon

Marian L. Gade

Joseph F. Kauffman

with a Resource Guide by

Sharon A. McDade

Sponsored by

American Association for Higher Education

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association — College Retirement Equities Fund

Published by

AAHE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

3

Bry Pollack, Managing Editor

Design by Design Innovations
Typesetting by Ten Point Type
Printing by Whitmore Printing

Table of Contents

v
Foreword
by Theodore J. Marchese

1
Five Approaches to Think About:
Lessons Learned From Experienced Presidents
by Estela Mara Bensimon

13
The President-Trustee Relationship
by Marian L. Gade

29
Strategies for an Effective Presidency
by Joseph F. Kauffman

43
Resource Guide
by Sharon A. McDade

About the Authors

Estela Mara Bensimon is assistant professor, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, and research associate, Institutional Leadership Project, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance.

Marian L. Gade is research associate, Office of the President, University of California, and Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley. With Clark Kerr, she is coauthor of *The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place & Character* and *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities.*

Joseph F. Kauffman is professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is the former president of Rhode Island College (1968–1973), the executive vice president emeritus of the University of Wisconsin System, and author of *At the Pleasure of the Board: The Service of the College and University President.*

Sharon A. McDade is director of the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard University and author of the ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report *Higher Education Leadership: Enhancing Skills Through Professional Development Programs.*

Theodore J. Marchese is vice president of AAHE and executive editor of *Change* magazine.

About AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization of faculty, administrators, and others throughout higher education and beyond who care about higher education as a whole. AAHE offers colleagueship and information through its publications, conferences, and special projects. For membership information, contact AAHE, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 293–6440 or Fax (202) 293–0073.

Note

Masculine and feminine pronouns are used alternately throughout this volume, and should not be construed as representing the real gender of the individual cited.

Foreword

by
Theodore J. Marchese

Former President Hadley of Yale used to tell the story of visits to his predecessors. Noah Porter, Yale's president in the 1870s, carried out his duties from a "study," its desk strewn with manuscripts, Porter himself most likely reading Kant. When Hadley visited Porter's successor, Timothy Light, he found him in an "office," on its desk the catalogs of competing institutions, with Light himself engrossed in budgets.

This anecdote—from John S. Brubacher's history *Higher Education in Transition*—is usually told to illustrate changes in the American college and its presidency. It tells, too, a tale of many presidents since: early contemplation, later the hundred details. And as we know, it's "the details" that eat up the hours—and presidents.

The present volume is for new presidents and the moments they find for contemplating tasks to come. Peggy Heim, senior research officer for TIAA-CREF, had the idea for it, a volume that would collect the "experience and advice" of practitioners and researchers, encompassing both "big picture" and "daily detail." Her initial hesitation—generalized advice is impossible, matters are ever situational—is transcended, I think, by the essays that follow, which are much less "how to" than templates for personal reflection. In a new president's shoes, I would read them for background, reminders, perhaps a resolve or two.

On Assuming a College or University Presidency serves these ends because of the wisdom and empathy of its contributors, starting

with Estela Bensimon's useful findings from interviews of presidents two and three years in office. Marian Gade's several years of research on presidents and their boards (done with Clark Kerr) show to good effect in the second essay. Joseph Kauffman concludes with some very practical suggestions, a baker's dozen in all, drawn from his long service as a president, presidential mentor, and institutional consultant. Capping off the volume, Sharon McDade's compilation of presidentially oriented institutes, workshops, and publications provides many useful references.

To Peggy Heim goes credit for conceiving this collection and arranging for its contributors. TIAA-CREF provided support for its publication and distribution, as it has over the years for a string of studies useful to college and university leaders. Thanks are due also to the Lilly Endowment, Inc., for its funding of research behind this volume, and to its senior program officer, Ralph Lungren, the creative, behind-the-scenes supporter of so many valuable projects.

I speak for both AAHE and TIAA-CREF in sending every new president best wishes. Your success is important to us, as it is to the students, faculty, and society we all serve.

Five Approaches to Think About: Lessons Learned From Experienced Presidents

by
Estela Mara Bensimon

Foreword

The recommendations I offer here are based on interviews I conducted with new presidents and faculty leaders participating in the Institutional Leadership Project, a research project of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. The data were gathered in face-to-face interviews in 1986 and 1987 in 14 campuses whose presidents had been in office for three years or less.

Supplemental data were drawn from three focused dialogues made possible through TIAA-CREF. I conducted two of these dialogues with 15 new presidents attending the January 1988 annual meeting of presidents held by the Council of Independent Colleges in San Diego, and the third with 6 new public college presidents participating in the January 1988 annual meeting of the American Council on Education in Washington, DC.

This document was prepared pursuant to grants from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Department of Education (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED, and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED should be inferred.

This essay is adapted from a July 1988 presentation I made at the Institute for Educational Management at the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Congratulations!

First, the good news. You have been chosen as a new college president, and your tenure begins in six months. Now, the bad news. Unlike corporate chief executive officers, you, like most of the three hundred new college and university presidents who take office annually, have not been groomed for the position by your predecessor. Instead, you will be starting out with two handicaps—you are inexperienced in the presidency, and you are an outsider to the institution.[1]

Although the creation of a presidential apprenticeship or internship has been proposed as a way of preparing newcomers for the position, such suggestions have not received serious attention. Studies of the college presidency consistently suggest that experience in the position makes the greatest difference to success. The next best thing to having experience is knowing something about how experienced presidents assume office in a new institution.

Interviews and dialogues I conducted during 1986–1988 with 35 new presidents revealed that those (10) who had previously held at least one other presidency approached a new position in ways that were distinctively different from first-time presidents.

Experienced presidents approached learning about their institutions more aggressively and more systematically. They felt keenly that before making any pronouncements, they needed to know the institution—not only as it looked from their office, but also as it looked to those who knew it intimately from other perspectives. For example, one president relied in particular on the "tribal elders," who still had sharp ears and good eyes but no agenda of their own to push.

Experienced presidents gave noticeably more attention than

1. Between September 1987 and September 1988, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported the appointment of 227 new presidents; 180 (79 percent) of the new presidents were outsiders and 172 (76 percent) were assuming a presidency for the first time.

the newcomers to the budget as something to "master" and as a means by which to "understand the institution." They also seemed more sensitive to the importance of knowing an institution's history and understanding its culture. They seemed to understand that each institution is unique, even institutions of the same type (for example, state colleges). Rather than trying to establish how the new institution was similar to the previous one, they looked for cultural and structural differences.

One president spoke of "not having understood" her previous institution, and of doing things there that caused trouble because they "violated" the culture. At the new institution, this president said, "I did it better and more efficiently than back there." While experience at the previous institution had suggested a "checklist," the president had been "astute enough to realize this college is different."

Experienced presidents emphasized the importance of learning about the institution without having an options-reducing "plan of action." One said, "I have always wondered about people who have plans. Much of a plan for an institution can be found in its history—what has worked in the past." More bluntly, another president said, "I think it is foolish to arrive with a plan, because colleges are subtle institutions." A plan not tailored to those subtleties clearly would not work.

Five Approaches of Experience

The ways experienced presidents approach a new presidency suggest the kinds of issues you will want to consider as you prepare to assume the presidency. Given that each campus situation is unique, the recommendations that follow are intended not as items on a checklist but as a way of *thinking about* being a new president.

Make several visits to your new campus before you assume office. Most experienced presidents I interviewed talked about preparing for a new presidency by making several visits. Some made the trip as frequently as once a week. In contrast, first-time presidents rarely visited; if they did, their approach was less systematic, and as a consequence they lost a lot of valuable learning time.

Presidents who visit the campus can start off more confidently because they feel they have a "handle on what people perceive

as problems and strengths of the institution." One president explained in these words:

> *I had half a year to prepare, and I made several trips there. When I came in, I knew about the college. I had talked to people in major units and knew their problems. . . . I understood the institution's mission, and the power base, and from that I had a good sense about what the institution could aspire to.*

Similarly, another president used the period before he officially assumed office to visit the campus to "determine what the goals and objectives of the institution were" and to see whether there was any "consensus on the campus regarding change." This planning process made it possible for this president to make major institutional changes with little disruptive effect soon after he arrived on campus.

Get to know and become known by the key players. When you plan your trips to the campus, spend time not with just your predecessor or the chair of the Board of Trustees or the chief administrative and academic officers. One experienced participant offered the following comparison:

> *The first time, I used only my predecessor and the chairman of the Board to brief me on the lay of the land. I walked into an institution that was virtually bankrupt, and nobody had told anybody until I had to start slashing. . . . The second time around, I had six months to make the transition. I flew down to my new institution once a week and worked out a whole transitional strategy so that by the time I took office I had met individually with over a hundred people—I hosted dinners for legislators, the CEOs of all corporations headquartered in my city, the faculty senate, the student leaders—virtually everybody whose approbation it would be beneficial to have. If I had to do it over again, I wouldn't do a single thing differently.*

Not surprisingly, this president added, "I don't think I could have done this had I not done it all wrong the first time around the track."

The payoff for this effort was that once the president arrived on campus, she was able to get things done a lot faster, because she was able to call on people she had met. The preparation made the work easier, and this president's ability to get things

done quickly and efficiently conveyed the image of a competent administrator.

In another case, the president of a small institution asked the academic vice president to prepare a list of every faculty member, with "about four sentences on each one describing his or her temperament and political position, and where they fit into the culture." This president memorized every name and description and in a sense got to know each member of the faculty before he arrived on campus.

Don't become a hostage out of ignorance: read, read, read. Too many presidents find out the hard way that they should have read the faculty manual or the state administrative code. Don't just count on your vice presidents for the information; do your homework as well.

One experienced president offered the following recommendation:

> *Be attentive to established processes—otherwise you will get creamed. If you don't like them, [later you can] change them. In the early part of the tenure, those procedures are real important. I found out the hard way that I should have been more familiar with the faculty manual and the bylaws of the college.*

If you overlook established procedures or assume that procedures are the same in all institutions and systems of higher education, you risk making mistakes that could undermine your credibility within the institution and the larger community.

A first-time president who was eager to make campus improvements and invested considerable sums to upgrade the physical plant was informed that the expenditures she authorized were "flagrant violations" of established procedures. Had this president not assumed that the procedures for spending money were the same as those in her previous institution, she would have avoided a situation that called attention to her unfamiliarity with her new campus.

Furthermore, faculty can become alienated when new presidents overlook established practices of consultation. For example, the president of a faculty senate commented that because the new president was unaware of senate committees, the committees were not as involved as they had been previously in matters related to "budget planning and promotion and tenure."

Reading can tell you what questions you need to ask. One campus president said, "[If you] look at four or five months of hometown newspapers and campus newspapers, you can get quite a good feeling for some of the concerns." Even if the papers simply "report on the basketball games or some innocuous things, it gives you some clues about the things that you want to ask questions about."

Your new college or university will have a past, and you should become familiar with it by studying the institution's historical documents. A president who was particularly sensitive to the customs and traditions of his new institution immersed himself in the written histories in order to understand the culture of the college. He found out that the school was a "comfortable and civil place, so. . . it was important to respect those feelings by doing things with a sense of fairness." Another president used historical references and the names of important institutional figures in her inaugural address to "make a point that we're building on a fantastic foundation."

Don't rush off in search of problems to solve. Asked what was the biggest mistake he had made, a first-time president responded, "If I could relive the last two years, I would try to do fewer things. But back then I felt an urgency."

In the beginning you might learn more by listening and observing, by simply being a student of the process. New presidents, particularly inexperienced ones, often are much too eager to find out what's wrong with the institution so they can have something to fix and feel they are making an important contribution. They may send out questionnaires to the faculty and staff asking them to identify problems and concerns, or they may hire a consultant to talk to faculty and staff and make recommendations. These are not necessarily bad things to do. But be careful not to base your approach on finding problems to solve.

While it is true that new presidents generally show a concern for assessing their institutions, presidents with previous experience tend to use more subtle and personal strategies. They seem to be more sensitive to the collegial, political, and symbolic processes that need to be attended to in the initial months of their tenure. For example, one president's method was to listen and observe and thereby form hypotheses about the institution, which she could then confirm or disprove with probing questions. Another

learned by attending state board meetings and observing how his university presented itself publicly. A third made it a habit to listen to those who dissented from the consensus.

What these experienced presidents seem to be saying is that sometimes a new president gains more by listening to and sensing the institution than by trying to determine how to turn it around. As one participant in my interviews observed,

> *The idea of either cleaning house or having a new vision or having a new start is kind of a corporate expectation when you come in and the place is in terrible trouble—and my college was not.*

In fact, most colleges and universities are not in need of, nor are they likely to respond well to, dramatic turnaround tactics.

Inexperienced presidents believe that the campus is waiting for them to take charge and act boldly. One first-time president thought that "you cannot come into the job tentatively because faculty can smell tentativeness." So, in fear of being seen as inactive, new presidents may be eager to make visible changes that make them appear action-oriented: they reorganize, they create and eliminate positions, they change the furniture, some even change the logo on the stationery.

Experienced presidents also make changes, but more slowly. They work through existing structures, and try not to appear as if they have come in "with their brooms to sweep the place clean." They recognize that the institution has been there for a long time and will still be there after they leave. They do not believe in "making unwarranted changes, in creating shock waves." Instead of charging ahead to transform the institution, they consult with others on campus, they work at gaining the support of important constituencies, and they avoid unilateral action. Said one president:

> *I decided to try to live with the existing system and players and not to make any changes for 10 months, until after I had a chance to see how it works.*

Presidents who favor an extended period of learning without making major changes would rather risk being seen as "inert" than risk the greater harm they may cause in their zeal to show who is in charge. Presidents who see themselves as slow may find, much to their surprise, that others on campus view them

differently. One president offered the following thought:

> *There is no need to artificially establish credentials as president--it's much better to listen and to go slowly, build on what's there. And I went out of my way to do that. I did it slow, and after six months began to worry I would get a reputation as the inert president. Then an article came out in the newspaper that listed all the things that people on campus felt had changed since my becoming president. Out of that more slow-moving context lots of changes had taken place, but I didn't have a sense that so much had happened.*

We all tend to associate dynamic leaders and leadership with visible, radical, and innovative change. But long-lasting changes tend to be evolutionary, not revolutionary.

Get involved in the budgetary process. Experienced presidents mentioned consistently that the budget was their first priority, both as something to "master" and as a means by which to "understand the institution." One referred to the budget as a "president's plan" and felt that by "dominating" it, she could be in control of what happened in the institution. One president remarked:

> *When I came here, the first thing I started to work with was the budget. . . . I welcomed that, because that is an efficient way to get to know an institution. . . . The budget process is an excellent learning vehicle.*

And another experienced president said that before taking office,

> *I spent two to three days a week at my new institution, and during those days I familiarized myself with the budget and budgeting process. As a result, within six months after taking office I raised faculty salaries, and it made me a hero.*

Accumulating Credits: The Give and Take of Leadership

The approaches I've outlined describe the kinds of activities a new president might undertake in what can be called the *discovery stage* of taking charge. The discovery stage has instrumental as well as symbolic value. The *instrumental value* is reflected in the five approaches. The *symbolic value* of the

discovery stage has to do with the image the initial take-charge actions convey to the campus community.

Experienced administrators seem to be saying that you cannot begin a college presidency with a preconceived plan. You have to understand the rhythm of the institution—the expectations of the campus, the school's history and its culture. If you spend time getting to know the institution, you will avoid violating institutional norms and you are more likely to be seen as someone who is willing to assimilate into the environment and to act in ways that are consistent with the institution's dominant values. Also, the information you gather and process during this stage and the contacts and relationships you establish will increase your knowledge and competence.

The symbolic value of the discovery stage can be understood from the perspective of transactional theory of leadership. This perspective suggests that rather than being a one-way process in which the leader influences followers, leadership is a two-way process of mutual influence and reciprocal relationships between leaders and followers.

A premise of transactional theory particularly relevant to new presidents is that constituents are more accepting of change and more tolerant of leadership behavior that deviates from their expectations if the leader accumulates credits beforehand by demonstrating his or her expertise and conformity to group norms (Hollander 1987). The five approaches I've presented suggest some of the ways in which you can accumulate important credits before introducing major change.

The reactions of a long-time faculty member to a new president whose actions reflected these five approaches underscore the impact that initial actions have on perceptions of a new leader. Asked to describe the new president, this faculty member replied,

> *In three months he knew more about the institution than anybody. He is a quick study and he can grasp almost anything instantly. Immediately he understood how po[illegible] the budget had been managed, who were the effective deans, [illegible] ins and outs. He knew more about the operations of this institution than anyone had in the last 15 years. He made great effort to meet the faculty. He had a dinner a week over a period of 18 months and got to meet all the faculty. He spent energy in getting to know the university. He knows more faculty than the previous president*

knew in all his years here. He wanders around—that was not the style of the previous administration. He is a terribly hard worker. He spends a lot of time absorbing the details of the university, and that gives him credence.

In the process of getting to know the campus, you will be able to find out what the different constituencies expect and need; what you learn in the discovery stage, then, will help you anticipate which of your proposals will be supported and which opposed. In this stage you can demonstrate that your approach to leadership is collegial and participative, that you are not coming in with a preconceived agenda. By giving all members of the institution's community the opportunity to comment, you convey that you want to hear what they have to say and to learn from them.

Presidents heading institutions in crisis are quite likely to disagree with these recommendations. New presidents of such schools feel the urgency of turning their institutions around, and tend to act quickly and authoritatively. In their judgment, they cannot afford the time required to meet expectations for "getting to know the institution" before introducing changes. They often believe that they have to start acting right away "to clean the place up."

Some do so in spite of faculty and staff expectations for a slower period of transition, learning, and deliberation. One president realized that the "faculty expected the president to study the institution before making a move." Yet this president thought that the college was in such a "state of disrepair, physically and spiritually," that she had no choice but to introduce changes swiftly, even if it meant alienating the faculty:

I have been accused of being autocratic, and I admit that is so. I had to be heavy-handed because of the situation. I needed to say, 'This is what we have to do.' Later, when we get out of it, I can be more democratic.

Later, however, may be too late. While quick and unwavering action may have short-range benefits, the long-range impact on your presidency can be detrimental: initial unilateral actions may leave an indelible impression and doom your subsequent collegial efforts. Just as it is difficult to break established patterns, it will be difficult to elicit fresh responses to your efforts at new behavior. Presidents who, in the urgency of resolving critical problems,

overlook consultative processes run the risk of not getting campus support or cooperation when the time comes to implement necessary changes.

Conclusion

Most new college presidents assume their positions with expectations and plans of action for providing the kind of leadership that will enable their institution to achieve a higher level of distinction. However, Kauffman (1980) observed that soon after taking office, college presidents quickly learn that it is very difficult for them to leave their mark on the institution. Campus expectations strongly influence what a president can realistically aspire to accomplish.

Presidents often become caught up in counteracting their predecessors' actions, ministering to a campus divided by conflict, or correcting budgetary deficiencies that they learn of only after taking office. That a president inherits an institutional history as well as an established constituency that can as easily reject as welcome bold reform attempts, severely limits the extent to which that president can heed calls for renewed and vigorous leadership.

With few exceptions, practical works on leadership in higher education tend to be guided by traditional conceptions of one-way rational leadership (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum 1989). Their authors emphasize administrative behaviors that will enable the new leader to gain control of the campus by doing such things as setting goals and priorities, making decisions, and providing direction and a vision of the future.

In contrast, the approaches I recommend emphasize a symbolic view of leadership. This view suggests that it is imperative for presidential aspirants and appointees to perceive their institutions as academic communities with distinctive histories and cultures (Dill 1982). New leaders might in the long run be more successful if, initially, they resist the urge to make an "impact," and instead concentrate on the rituals that signify they are "joining" (Gilmore 1988) with the institution.

References

Bensimon, Estela M., Anna Neumann, and Robert Birnbaum. 1989. *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" Word in Higher Education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.

Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Dill, David D. 1982. "The Management of Academic Culture: Notes on the Management of Meaning and Social Integration." *Higher Education* 11:303–320.

Gilmore, Thomas North. 1988. *Making a Leadership Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hollander, Edwin P. 1987. "College and University Leadership From a Social Psychological Perspective: A Transactional View." Prepared for the Invitational Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Leadership in Higher Education, sponsored by the Institutional Leadership Project, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Teachers College, New York.

Kauffman, Joseph F. 1980. *At the Pleasure of the Board: The Service of the College and University President*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

The President–Trustee Relationship Or, What Every New President Should Know About The Board

by
Marian L. Gade

Foreword

This essay is based on research I conducted in collaboration with Clark Kerr for the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC. Results are reported in the following publications of that association: *Presidents Make a Difference*, a report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership (Clark Kerr, chair), 1984; Clark Kerr and Marian L. Gade, *The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place & Character*, 1986; and Clark Kerr and Marian L. Gade, *The Guardians: Boards of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities*, 1989.

A Crucial Relationship

The relationship between a college or university's Board of Trustees and its CEO (whether called "president," "chancellor," or some other title) is among the most crucial in an institution of higher education, perhaps surpassed only by the very delicate relationship between teacher and student. Together, board and president hold the present and future of the institution in their hands. Potential and incoming presidents need to think carefully about how they can best relate to the board—as its "employee," as its educator, as its partner, and as a full-fledged member, in fact if not always in name. Presidents

need to think, too, about their special relationship with individual board members, especially the chair.

New presidents almost always enter into the job with but scant knowledge of how boards in general actually function, and even less understanding of the dynamics of their particular board. When asked what surprised them, many new presidents say, "The Board. I thought I understood it, but I didn't." Even former vice presidents will probably have worked more closely with one or another board committee than with the board as a whole. Moreover, their experience is generally confined to substantive matters—academic affairs or finances—and does not encompass a broad view of the board as a separate institutional constituency with its own history, culture, set of actors, and ways of work.

The president-board relationship is essential, but fraught with peril. In 1971 and again in 1981, Bruce Alton surveyed former presidents to find out what precipitated their leaving office. In the 10 years between his two studies, "relationship with the governing board" went from 14th to 3rd in importance (Alton 1982).

Barbara E. Taylor (1987) has described the president-board connection as an "exchange relationship" (p. 71) in which board and president are interdependent and in which they exchange a variety of intangibles. For example, support for the president from trustees may be exchanged for validation of their position as community leaders. Or, the parties may exchange authority, for example, "functional" authority of the president, who has the expertise, in return for the "formal" authority trustees have by virtue of institutional charters or founding statutes. The point is that neither board nor president can function effectively without the other, and experience indicates that strong and effective boards *and* strong and effective presidents tend to go together. The Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership concluded,

> *An effective presidency starts, but does not end, with an effective board. We have found that the following tend to go together: an effective board, an effective chair of the board, an effective presidency, an effective president* (Commission 1984, p. 12).

In this essay I will suggest some key elements of the president-trustee relationship that candidates participating in the search and selection process, and new presidents undertaking the presidency of a college or university, should consider carefully.

Boards, too, need to think about their role in this relationship, but the major responsibility for making the partnership work falls upon the president, who may need to help the board understand and fulfill its obligations in appropriate ways.

The Trials of Search

In our studies of presidents and trustees over the past eight years, Clark Kerr and I (with some assistance) have conducted more than a thousand interviews with presidents, their spouses, trustees, researchers, and others who are part of or are studying the governance of higher education. We probably heard more horror stories about the process of presidential search and selection than about any other aspect of the presidency, with the possible exception of the President's House, a closely related topic.

The relationship between board and president begins during search and selection. While there are several good essays on appropriate behaviors for all parties during that process,[1] let me mention just three ways things often go wrong unnecessarily.

Not enough information is shared. Candidates naturally want to put their best foot forward, and search committees want to retain the best candidates in the pool, so neither individual nor institution may be sufficiently candid to provide the information each needs to make a good match and propitious start. Of the two, the search committee generally has greater access to knowledgeable people. It can cast a wider net, and many committees use consultants to gather information without sacrificing the confidentiality the candidate deserves and should be promised.

The presidential hopeful, on the other hand, is at something of a disadvantage in assessing current institutional conditions as well as potential obstacles and opportunities for the future. One board chair I interviewed said, laughing, "The Board never levels

1. See, for example, John W. Nason, *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984); and *Deciding Who Shall Lead: Recommendations for Improving Presidential Searches*, (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, n.d.).

with the president; if we did, we'd never hire anyone."

In her essay in this volume, Estela Bensimon notes the strong advice from experienced presidents that candidates and new presidents should *read*—faculty handbooks, histories, the catalog, accreditation reports, the audit, and most important, the budget. While her suggestion is excellent, candidates, and even a new president, may find locating these materials difficult. Trustees themselves may not know some of them exist.

For this reason, and others, trustees may not be good sources of information about the state of an institution's health. We found situations where the board members themselves, or at least those serving on the search committee, were unaware that a college had been running deficits for years and was millions of dollars in debt; the committee members were assuring candidates that the institution was in solid financial condition. More frequently, there is a history of only small deficits or of budgets balanced by invading endowments, deferring essential maintenance, or neglecting library acquisitions and lab equipment. Outgoing presidents and business managers can hide these or other problems from a too-trusting board, and the new president may not discover "where the bodies are buried" until several months into his or her term of office. Potential presidents should try to learn as much as possible about the institution before accepting the position.

New presidents don't think carefully about the personal support they will need to perform well and feel comfortable in the job. Some boards are outstanding in providing clear contractual terms, providing for presidential renewal at intervals, and supporting the presidential family. But most trustees work on the assumption that anyone bright and competent enough to guide their institution is also smart enough to look out for herself or himself and ask for what's needed. Not so.

First-time presidents, especially, are idealistic. They have great plans for the college or university and don't want to appear petty or selfish by concentrating on such mundane matters as benefits. Neither do they want to risk not being offered the job by looking too closely ahead of time at working conditions or by asking too many questions.

As a result, some new presidents move into the President's House only to find that the roof leaks—an all-too-common

occurrence. Or, they find out too late to object that they are expected to save the best bedroom for the board chair and spouse to use during trustee meetings. Or, they bring their own furniture and possessions into the home without adequately considering whose insurance will cover damages.

They accept a position where the average tenure is a little under seven years without a written contract or any provision for a severance agreement, leaving themselves stranded when the almost inevitable separation occurs a few years later. And, they come to preside over an institution that grants its faculty 3 months vacation every year and a year's sabbatical after seven years. Yet they are expected to work at least 11 months a year, year in and year out, while keeping up with their own academic field.

Trustees strive to get the best candidate to take the job. They do not begrudge support, but someone needs to tell them what the president needs. David Riesman suggests a negotiator—to function something like the Japanese marriage broker, or "go between," by negotiating appropriate terms between the new president and the Board of Trustees. Although his recommendation is unlikely to be widely adopted, some new presidents do retain a lawyer or other consultant. In any event, the incoming president will continue to be responsible for thinking about, and talking to the board about, the kinds of personal, social, and family support essential for financial security and peace of mind.

New presidents don't get to know members of their board individually, or maintain these contacts throughout their presidency. Candidates deal mostly with search committees and may not meet the full board membership until an interview fairly late in the process. Even then, the interview setting is not conducive to getting to know individual trustees—their hopes for you and for the college, their special talents, their concerns and orientations, their desired degree of participation in the institution's affairs.

Once a new president is appointed, she or he should try to get to know the members of the board individually at the earliest possible moment. The board chair, of course, is the crucial player, but don't neglect the other members. Experienced presidents offer one strategy: take a trustee to lunch, where you can establish rapport and explore views.

Three Rules for President-Trustee Relationships

You've survived the search process—becoming one of the three hundred or so candidates appointed to presidencies each year. What can you expect from your Board of Trustees? And, what can the board expect from you? Before I move on to mutual expectations, I want to offer three "rules" that both new presidents and trustees ought to bear in mind in dealing with the other.

- **No surprises.** Neither the board nor the president should ever take the other by surprise, especially not in public, and most especially not in the newspapers.

- **Support each other, at least in public.** Neither president nor board should undercut the other with faculty, students, alumni, the governor, the legislature, or the public. Argue in private (where Sunshine Laws requiring open meetings and records permit), and remember that it is the institution that always loses when internal battles go public.

- **Communicate, communicate, then communicate some more.**

What a President Ought to Be Able To Expect From the Board

As I said at the outset, the major responsibility for making the president-trustee partnership work falls upon the president. But the trustees, too, have responsibilities. Little in life is ideal, but in the best of situations, a new president can expect the following from the Board of Trustees:

- **That the board undertook a *search for the future of the institution*, as its first step in the presidential search and selection process.** Only after such soul searching should a board begin its search for a president who will help the institution achieve a particular set of outcomes. An incoming president should expect the board to offer a relatively clear sense of direction either prior to the president taking the position or as a first order of business afterwards.

A president expects, of course, to be a full partner with the board, and usually its leader, in "casting a vision" of the future,

as one president put it, and in determining how to achieve the desired outcomes. At the same time, the board needs to have a sense of the institution's mission, or "niche," in the ecology of higher education, so that the president has some notion of what job he or she is actually undertaking.

All parties need to be clear about where the institution is going in the next two, three, or five years. The goals should be realistic and attainable given the time and resources, and both the bench marks and the criteria for judging success should be mutually agreeable.

A corollary is that a president should be evaluated by the board on the basis of how well he or she has achieved the desired outcomes, and not in terms of some different set of expectations. Where board membership changes rapidly, the board that evaluates a president may not be the same group of people who made the appointment. Without a clear written statement of expectations, you could be faulted for failing to carry out a variety of tasks that were never even discussed as part of your responsibilities.

The general procedures, timing, and criteria for evaluation should be made clear at the outset. Evaluations are best handled in a private and informal way that also includes a review of board performance and of overall institutional progress. A board should never conduct a review in a way that encourages organized attacks upon a president or provides a public forum for personal vendettas on the part of faculty or staff (Commission 1984, pp. 53–58).

That you and the board together will work out guidelines for those areas in which the board will retain final authority and decision making. The best plan seems to be this: the board specifies the areas it will retain and it delegates everything else to the president. With such guidelines in place, expect the board, and especially individual trustees, to avoid "meddling" in administrative matters. At the same time, you must provide sufficient information so that the board can carry out its policy-making, review, and monitoring functions. Work out the inevitable borderline cases with the board chair or the appropriate committee chair.

As we interviewed presidents across the country, we found considerable dissatisfaction with this aspect of president-board relationships. It will never be possible to draw a hard-and-fast

line between what is "policy" (the board's responsibility) and what is "administration" (the president's), but some guidelines at the beginning would probably have reduced some of the tensions that now exist. However, presidents must recognize that anything adverse to the institution that finds its way into the media must, of necessity, be brought to the board, even if only for its information. The board should hear bad news early and from the president, not from the press; moreover, whenever possible, the president should warn the board in advance of possible crises.

Presidents must also realize that anything that greatly interests the board, or the chair, will be defined by the board as "policy." One president told me, not entirely facetiously,

> *If I make a decision, and the Board thinks it was the right decision, then it must have been an administrative matter and I was correct in going ahead. If the Board, or any significant portion of it, believes it was not the right decision, then it obviously was a policy matter and I should have brought it to the Board!*

That you will be supported in your personal life. I discussed this point briefly in connection with the search and selection process, but it is a sufficiently neglected area to bear repeating. The job of president of a college or university is a public one; it demands much time and energy, and one's whole family becomes involved. The board is responsible for providing adequate housing, maintenance, and resources for official entertaining. The board needs to remember that those thousands of people who visit the President's House every year are almost all institution donors, supporters, and constituents whom the president is entertaining, not personal friends.

The board should support appropriate roles for family members in the presidential household, to the extent the members desire to participate. The board should be especially careful to consult the president's spouse (if there is one) to determine what role he or she would like to play in the life of the institution, and then provide adequate support for that role. No one should assume that a spouse, particularly a woman, will automatically be available to assist with entertaining, fund raising, football brunches, faculty teas, and so on. "One for the money, two for the show" or a policy of "two for the price of one" is no longer appropriate. However, it will fall to the president, during contract

negotiations, to raise these issues with the board.

Most boards are supportive but do not think to mention these kinds of things. Some, especially in public institutions, are afraid of being accused of discrimination if they even inquire into the existence of a spouse during the search process. The spouse, even if interviewed by the board, generally finds it difficult to discuss the types and amounts of support needed to carry out the institution's social responsibilities, much less to request the assistance required.

Be prepared to ask the board about working out satisfactory arrangements, both to carry out institutional responsibilities and to provide adequate personal and family support. Different institutions have different expectations regarding the presidency and the resources provided, so ask.

The matter of the President's House is frequently among the most delicate. I have come to believe that the outgoing president, during the "lame-duck" period, should probably undertake any necessary repairs, refurbishing, or remodeling, even at the risk of establishing an ambience that is not exactly what the new president would have chosen. Too many presidents have come to grief by taking the board at its word when it says, "Fix up the President's House the way it should be," especially where such work requires the expenditure of public funds.

Another alternative, which Joe Kauffman suggests elsewhere in this volume too, is for the institution to provide a housing allowance or some other mechanism by which the president can purchase a personal home, thus building equity as well as providing the possibility of some privacy. Kauffman's accompanying advice to find an out-of-town retreat is wise in any event because campus and community tend to think of even "private" homes as "public" when they are occupied by college and university presidents.

Another personal aspect of the presidency that a board should actively consider is presidential renewal and professional development. Presidents do take their jobs seriously, and even where contracts call for vacations or sabbaticals, many presidents put off taking them. The board should insist that the vacation time be used, and encourage sabbatical leaves that allow the president time to read, reflect, or catch up on her or his field of scholarly interest. Many boards also pay for president and spouse to attend professional meetings, and all boards should be encouraged to provide such support.

Presidents and trustees alike must understand that these provisions for support and renewal are not motivated by altruism on the part of the board, but rather are ways to preserve the health, vigor, and interest of an asset in which the institution has invested considerable time and money: its president. It is false economy to "burn out" a president and then be forced to expend time and money in recruiting someone new.

That the board will support you as an academic leader. Academics is the *raison d'être* for the institution, and the president should expect full board support in heading up that side of the college or university. I'm not suggesting that either the board or the president become overly involved in matters properly left to the faculty under a system of shared governance, but only the board and president can see the institution as a whole. Only they, working together, can preserve the balance of missions, of clientele; for example, perhaps only they will be able to push for a core of "general" or "liberal" education, against pressure from departments urging greater specialization and more requirements for the major and from students for more electives. Clark Kerr and I found that only 20 percent of the presidents we studied significantly engaged in all aspects of their institution's academic life; within that group, only about 2 percent played a central role in all areas.[2]

In addition, the president needs full board support in carrying out what has been called "the most important [responsibility] in terms of the educational strength of the college," that is, "evaluating and approving faculty appointments and promotions" (Carnegie 1977, p. 69).

That the board will provide you with friendship, a sounding board, and wise counsel. The board chair especially can be an invaluable ally in charting a course for the institution and leading it to excellence. But the president has a responsibility here, too, to be open to such advice and counsel. If you indicate that you think of the input from the board or from individual members

2. See Kerr and Gade, *Many Lives, op.cit.*, p. 109, for the eight aspects of academic life about which this judgment was made.

as meddling or intruding, your trustees will cease trying to be helpful.

A president especially needs the board's support in times of trouble or crisis. When the president is attacked for carrying out unpopular policies that the trustees themselves put in place, they should give support, rather than make the president a scapegoat.

A graceful and dignified ending to your presidency when the time comes, no matter what the reasons for leaving. The board should define the terms of exit early on, preferably at the time they select a president and terms are negotiated. Unfortunately, many people consider making such provisions analogous to settling the terms of the divorce at the time of the wedding. Consequently, this important aspect of the presidency is often not discussed.

On average, a president's tenure is about seven years. At any given time, about one-quarter of the more than three thousand presidents are in trouble or unhappy in their job, are thinking of leaving, or are in the process of leaving. Some outgoing presidents will return immediately to teaching and research; others who want to do so have been away from their scholarly field for so long that they need six months or a year to retool.

Regardless, it is generally unwise for an outgoing president to remain on campus as the new president takes over. Before joining (or rejoining) the faculty, the outgoing president should absent him or herself for at least a year. In this way, the outgoing president is not present to second-guess his or her successor or to be a focal point for faculty and staff disgruntled by the inevitable changes that will take place. Let the new president ask the outgoing president to leave a forwarding address in case advice is wanted.

Some outgoing presidents may find it difficult to return to teaching for other reasons. One said, "I think I would find it hard to be a good union member again after being on the other side of the bargaining table." These people may need time to define and develop new careers for themselves, either inside or outside higher education. Boards could consider providing a year's turnaround time with pay, assist with what in business is known as "outplacement," or both.

Boards should provide supportive and graceful exits not just for humanitarian reasons but because a poorly handled exit makes finding a highly qualified successor considerably more difficult.

What the President Owes the Board

In any partnership, both parties are encumbered with expectations and responsibilities. This is especially true for a president. I've said that the president may need to help the board understand and fulfill its obligations. Accordingly, a Board of Trustees ought to be able to expect the following from its president:

Appropriate education, orientation, and training for the job. In our interviews with trustees, we found few institutions that provide even a minimally adequate orientation to the role of trustee and to the specific institution. New trustees, even those with experience on corporate boards, frequently need a general orientation to the role of board member in an academic institution. They often do not understand the special environment and arcane procedures (fund-balance accounting or shared governance with faculty) that characterize higher education. The president should see that orientation sessions take place, but much of the "role orientation" can be done only by another trustee or an outsider; the board chair or governance committee, if there is one, bears major responsibility in this area.

Presidents should ensure that board members receive a proper orientation to the institution, however. Unless the new trustees are alumni, they probably do not know the institution's unique history, traditions, and mission. They generally benefit from sessions with key administrators, including legal counsel, to learn about current conditions as well as their responsibilities. New trustees may also need a general orientation to higher education in the state, region, or nation and to societal trends that affect the institution or higher education as a whole. Most presidents were once teachers, and many regard the boardroom as their current "classroom."

With the board chair, take the lead in encouraging trustees to participate in activities that will increase their confidence and effectiveness: campus events, workshops run by state or national organizations, sessions with outside consultants familiar with higher education issues or board structure and performance, retreats for self-examination and evaluation of board effectiveness, and social events where board members can get acquainted and thus feel more comfortable working together. Even in public institutions operating under Sunshine Laws these activities are both feasible and helpful.

Ongoing staff service from the institution. Trustees need an adequate, but not overwhelming, flow of information on which they can rely to form judgments and make decisions. For the board meeting itself, this includes a well-prepared board agenda with background materials and documentation; timely notification of potential problems; recommendations from the president on each agenda item that requires action, along with reasons and possible alternatives that were considered but rejected; and feedback on the results of and reactions to prior actions.

Trustees need, in addition, a good flow of information between meetings. Many presidents send frequent, and often quite informal, letters to the board as often as once a week covering what's new on campus, who's won an award, major personnel changes, and so on. Most important, trustees want to know about any crises—before they get an early morning call from a reporter wanting information or reaction.

Arrangements for providing this ongoing service to trustees differ. Almost always someone called a "board secretary" exists, but this position is usually combined with another job, such as assistant to the president or executive vice president. Some board staff report only to the board, but most report dually to both board and president or are responsible only to the president (Smotony 1986).

Presidents also need to structure board meetings and other trustee meetings so members have ample time to discuss major items before the meeting at which decisions must be made. Trustees rightfully resent being presented with a controversial recommendation so late that they cannot possibly modify it or look at alternatives.

Where possible, help in "building the board" and structuring it for effective performance. Building the board involves identifying needed skills, seeking people with those skills, and working with the board's nominating committee to recruit competent and talented board members. In most private institutions, presidents consider board building a major part of their job. In public institutions, where board members are publicly elected or politically appointed, some presidents are comfortable suggesting names to the appointing authorities, such as the governor; others will only go so far as to suggest the kinds of people and skills the board needs. In still other situations,

presidents avoid involvement with trustee selection altogether, believing that their suggestions will be considered unwarranted interference, or fearing that someone who is not appointed will be told, "But the president didn't want you on the board."

A new president will do well to consider the traditions of the state and institution before actively recruiting new trustees. However, along with the board chair, you are in the best position to look to the long-term strength of the board and should try to find ways to help fill the board with committed and able individuals.

The board should also be able to expect help in structuring itself to conduct its business most efficiently. Most boards, except some that are very small, operate through a committee system, with the president assigning staff to work with each committee. The president and board chair need to work very closely in this area, as elsewhere, to ensure a good mix of skills, experience, and expertise on each committee.

With the concurrence of the board, some presidents convene an advisory committee or group, perhaps consisting of prominent local citizens, to assist in public relations or fund raising and as a way of identifying and preparing potential board members. Many presidents of multi-campus institutions who do not have their own campus-level boards find such councils good liaisons to the city or region, and they sometimes function as a sounding board or source of counsel for the president. Some use the board of the institution's foundation in these capacities. Where both a governing board and an advisory group exist, however, the president must be careful not to turn over to the advisory group matters that properly belong to the legal governing board.

A close working relationship, especially with the board chair. One seasoned observer said this about the relationship between a president and the board chair:

> *Whatever the exact embroidery of the relationship, the basis must be a clear understanding of the responsibilities and authorities of each position, an intuitive grasp of the times when each should take the lead on an action or issue, and an underlying sense of the paired role in institutional leadership* (Pocock 1988, p. 16).

The chair is the chief spokesperson for the board; chief

disciplinarian when other board members step out of line and "need to be taken to the woodshed," as one trustee put it; and under ideal circumstances, the president's principal counselor, confidante, and chief protector. The personal relationship between president and chair is crucial; mutual respect and compatibility can immensely enhance their ability to further the work of the board and the institution.

In addition to this close working and personal relationship with the board chair, the president also should get to know the other board members individually. This, of course, is easier when the board is small, most trustees live nearby, and the board meets frequently. In institutions where the board is large, far-flung, and meets only a few times a year, the relationship between the president and the board chair (and perhaps that between the president and the other members of the executive committee) becomes even more crucial.

Absolute integrity. As one interviewee told me, a president may have to phrase messages in many different ways for different constituencies, but the message must ultimately be the same for everyone. In our many interviews, we heard over and over again that while the most essential characteristic of a trustee is commitment, the most essential for a president is integrity.

The relationship between president and board is indeed a crucial one. The need for a "fit" or "match" between the president and the institution and its board was something we heard frequently from everyone who was interviewed. When both the new president and the Board of Trustees bring to that relationship commitment to the values and vitality of the institution, as well as integrity in their dealings with each other and with all other constituencies, they pave the path for a fruitful relationship and a successful presidency.

References

Alton, Bruce T. 1982. "Why Presidents Quit." *AGB Reports* 24(1):47–53.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1977. *Missions of the College Curriculum.* A commentary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. 1984.

Presidents Make a Difference. A report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership (Clark Kerr, chair). Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Pocock, John W. 1988. "Maintaining Effective Board Chair–CEO Relationships." In *Making Trusteeship Work: A Guide to Governing Board Organization, Policies, and Practices.* Edited by Richard T. Ingram and Associates. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Smotony, Bonnie M. 1986. "A Secretary Is Not Necessarily a Rose." *AGB Reports* 28(6):33–36.

Taylor, Barbara E. 1987. *Working Effectively With Trustees: Building Cooperative Campus Leadership.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Strategies For An Effective Presidency

by
Joseph F. Kauffman

I have been asked to write this advice to new college and university presidents to aid in their early effectiveness. What follows is based on my past research on new presidents, my years as a college president and system administrator, and my recent experiences as a consultant to a variety of institutional governing boards and presidents. I write with a participant's heart, with empathy for the presidential experience rather than the detachment of a social scientist.

The first observation that I must make is that one cannot generalize about the college and university presidency—even though that is what I shall do. Each institution has its own unique history, ethos, politics, and possibility. And, therefore, each presidency is different. In the small college, the president plays a more personal role; he or she may be expected to know each faculty member and many students and to deal with problems in face-to-face negotiation or conversation. In large universities, on the other hand, the president may be a distant figure to faculty and students (the ascription "CEO" seems to fit here); in such settings, the president delegates day-to-day operations to a cabinet or management team and rarely meets with either faculty or students to resolve grievances. In large state systems of institutions, campus presidents spend lots of time dealing with system officials and may be judged on their campus by how effective they are in such dealings; they may be judged by system administrators

by how cooperative a team player they are.

I use the title "president," then, to encompass all of these different types of institutional heads—even as I affirm the uniqueness of each presidency.

Strategies for Success

When asked by newly appointed presidents for my advice, I usually respond with two cryptic observations—one somewhat facetious, the other quite serious. The first is to recall the instructions of the referee to the boxers: "No low blows below the belt, but protect yourselves at all times."

The second bit of advice, more seriously dispensed, is this: "Don't expect all of your efforts to be appreciated." That may sound cynical, but I am definitely not a cynic about the presidency. I am a realist who knows that if you are motivated primarily by the approval and appreciation of those you serve, the presidency can be a cruel experience. You must know who you are, your values and self-worth, or you are in for a difficult time. If you need applause, try show business instead.

To provide advice for a successful presidency, one must have in mind some criteria for assessing presidential performance. Many observers have commented on the ambiguity of "success" for presidents, most notably Cohen and March (1974). In my own research I have noted the contradictions, expressed to me by presidents, between how they wish to be judged on their performance and the reality of how they will probably be judged. I have conducted a number of presidential appraisals and can attest to the different and ambiguous measures that are invoked by various constituencies, the variety of "bottom lines" used by the different interest groups to judge performance.

Peter Drucker, certainly a competent observer of management and managers, has written of the need to redesign the college presidency because it seems so difficult for incumbents to succeed. He said, "Any job that has defeated two or three men in succession, even though each had performed well in his previous assignments, must be assumed unfit for human beings" (Drucker 1966).

True, there is considerable turnover in the college presidency; there is discouragement and burnout. Yet, with all of the difficulties, there are many successful presidents, thriving and productive men and women who derive great satisfaction from their role and service. What factors contribute to their success

and satisfaction? I believe I have found at least a partial answer in strategies covering a dozen or so areas, and I want to share those here. Some of the areas are organizational, but many of the most important are personal. I am not sure how to rank them in order of importance but here they are for your consideration.

Leadership. Volumes have been written on this subject, so I'll state my view on only a few aspects. The most recent survey of the literature on the topic is the forthcoming ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership* by Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989), which will be useful to scholars and practitioners alike.

Our colleges and universities are different from many other kinds of organizations. The essential purposes for which they are created are to provide teachers, scholars, and students with resources, libraries, laboratories, classrooms, and an environment so that learning, the pursuit of intellectual and creative endeavors, and the like can take place. Those pursuits are diverse, often individualistic, and not very amenable to coercion from management or to central control. Consequently, the president must remember that no matter how concerned the governing board is with management and its tools, most of the faculty, professional staff, and students do not regard management as the principal value in the academic enterprise. Patricia Plante (1988) states it succinctly: "Colleges and universities were not created for the purpose of administering them."

It follows, then, that the language a president adopts in the boardroom or the legislature need not be the same language she or he uses on campus. When on campus, the president must be able to articulate the value and purpose of a learning enterprise in terms that campus constituencies can embrace. They may appreciate the need for sound management, but management is not the essential *purpose* of the institution, nor is it the reason why students and faculty are there. Their fidelity is to a nobler purpose, or to their own desire for self-development.

In addition to showing respect for and nurturing a strong sense of institutional purpose, a new president needs to involve the parties who must implement changes. When asking why some practices exist, or suggesting new initiatives, do so in a manner that does not imply criticism of what went on before your arrival. Often a new leader will unknowingly make a governing board

or campus senate defensive about the previous era, as though people had not met their responsibilities. Whether this is so or not, appearing to sit in judgment of the behavior of others is not conducive to winning their wholehearted support for your new initiatives. Furthermore, if you do win their support and your initiatives are successful, take care that you share the credit widely. Like all good leaders, a president must be prepared to take full responsibility for failure, yet share the credit for success.

I must make one other point. The president is not the only leader; he or she must empower others to exercise leadership. For example, the moral and educational authority of a college or university flows from the faculty and the academic nature of the institution. If the faculty do not care about the learning environment, civility of discourse, and the like—leaving such matters to the administration—then the institution suffers. The president must have high expectations for the performance of the governance organizations, committees, department chairs, deans, and others. Taking charge does not mean relieving others of their responsibilities; rather, it means seeing to it that others meet their responsibilities.

Vision. A new president is expected to develop a vision of where the institution should be going and a strategy for getting there. This is important not only for communicating to others but as a reference point in building and defending the institution's budget. But that vision is not the president's alone, nor does it have to originate wholly with the president. I'm talking here not about a personal vision, but about an institutional direction. If people see the vision as personal, they may resent and resist it. Rather, in the vision the president should seek to encapsulate the history and aspirations of those who have gone before and endeavored to build the institution and its programs, including its alumni and donors.

By their very nature, colleges and universities must constantly renew themselves, yet they cannot start over. The resources for adaptation and renewal are mainly the human resources inherited by each new president. In developing a vision you can articulate, and others can support, you must do at least two things. First, listen to others and consult with others who care about the institution and have a stake in its success, including people outside as well as inside the institution. What are their concerns and

aspirations? Study the institution well enough to never be surprised by what motivates the constituencies who affect your institution. Second, as you develop your own agenda and priorities for your institution, place these in a context that includes the concerns of others and does not appear to substitute yours for theirs.

What I am describing is a form of strategic thinking that acknowledges that everything is connected to everything else, and incorporates political and psychological factors in setting forth a plan of action. Let me illustrate: Suppose I find that lack of space significantly concerns faculty, yet one of my priorities is a new program that will require space. To get support from the faculty for my new program initiative, then, I must add the creation of additional space to my list of top priorities. Similarly, if my governing board is concerned with the cumulative fiscal impact of adding new programs, I could accompany my advocacy of the new program with a pledge to review and drop moribund programs.

Quality. A president should have high expectations of faculty and students, but relate those expectations to the purpose and character of the specific institution. When we speak of "quality," we frequently look at it with our own unique bias. We know that certain kinds of institutions are more prestigious and respected than others. We may think that "raising standards" to emulate these prestigious colleges and research institutions will automatically result in more prestige and respect for our institution. Untrue. For example, raising standards for faculty promotion and tenure—perhaps by insisting that faculty publish in refereed journals in order to qualify for promotion—does not necessarily increase quality. Unfortunately I have witnessed this kind of thinking at both four-year colleges and community colleges.

Quality must have a context, which includes such ingredients as institutional purpose, students served, and faculty understandings. A new president must understand and respect this context. You may wish to move in a direction that will change that context, but you cannot achieve your goal by fiat. Talking about "quality" and "excellence" may be the popular thing to do, but you cannot suddenly change the ground rules without building some understanding and support for change. Similarly, you cannot disparage the quality of your institution simply because it is not highly selective.

Both president and institution hope that the search and selection process will result in the right match. Sadly, I have seen some candidates want a presidency so badly that they do not look at the "match" issue until after they are appointed. Then they try to make changes to meet their own needs rather than those of the people served by their institution.

Stewardship. We typically speak of leadership and management when we discuss the presidential role and tasks. I have spoken of leadership already, relating it to the clarifying and nourishing of a sense of purpose, to a sense of direction. Management is the implementation of policy decisions, maintaining the institution efficiently and effectively. Leadership can be shared, but it is the president's primary responsibility; management can be delegated, but the president remains accountable. Now I want to add a third dimension—what I refer to as stewardship.

The word *stewardship* is a religious term, one we infrequently use when talking about public colleges and universities. It is found first in the Old Testament, then more often in the New Testament ("stewards of God"); it is sometimes translated as "overseer" or "guardian." I use it to link presidents with the efforts and sacrifices of those who have served before them to protect the integrity of the institution they are privileged to lead for a while. In many ways the persona of the president is tied to this concept, especially in church-related institutions. But in all institutions, the president's character and behavior is reflected in the perceptions of the institution's integrity, and a president needs to be mindful of this responsibility. As a president, you are not only a leader or manager but also the guardian of the integrity of your institution. I call that stewardship.

Inheriting a staff. Unlike the model of civil government, where a new president has free rein to select senior staff, new college and university presidents inherit theirs. Your first order of business should be to convey to these staffers the new ground rules—your expectations, your criteria for evaluating them, the need for candor, and your receptivity to opinions different from your own.

Unfortunately, a new president often has reason to be wary of these top officers' motives and advice. The Kerr report *Presidents*

Make a Difference (1984) refers to "untouchables" (p. 7), senior staff who have special relationships with governing board members and the employment security that accompanies such relationships; obviously, inheriting untouchables can be dysfunctional for a new president. Also, it is not so unusual to find that the vice president or provost was the leading inside candidate for the presidency, and now that person is the top deputy and senior advisor.

For these and other reasons, before accepting a presidency, assess the degree of freedom you will have to replace unsatisfactory staff. If there are senior staffers whom your board considers unsatisfactory, try to have them released before you start your appointment. Otherwise, the board will expect one of your first acts to be the firing of these senior people, whose following are sure to complicate your beginning year as president.

Ultimately, a new president must face a serious reality: to either tolerate a less-than-ideal staff and try to convert them; or force their resignations, deal with the controversy that may entail, and hope to recruit the ideal people you have in mind. To pursue the latter course usually means making a commitment to stay in your post long enough to rebuild what you have torn apart. This sober consideration frequently results in the decision to make-do. It can be frustrating.

Relations with the governing board. Elsewhere in this volume, Marian Gade discusses the relationship between a president and the governing board. This is such an important topic for new presidents that I want to add a brief word, with my own emphasis.

A new president, typically, has been very successful in previous positions and has the security and respect that comes from such success. In moving to a presidency, he or she voluntarily becomes vulnerable again. The new president is employed by the governing board, at whose pleasure the president serves. A major task, therefore, is to gain and maintain the board's confidence.

Never take your board for granted. No matter how difficult some individual board members may be, get to know them individually. Establish effective communication with them. Let board members know what is going on, seek their advice, encourage one-on-one airing of concerns about agenda items and impending policy decisions. In many independent institutions,

where meetings are private, boards may decide by consensus. In most public institutions board meetings are public theater, complete with drama and controversy but rarely unanimity in voting. All the more reason for good personal communication and mutual respect. However, both must be cultivated.

Of greatest importance is the relationship between the president and the chair of the governing board. Before accepting a post, find out how long the current chair will serve and who is in line to succeed that person. It is not at all unusual for a new president to be assured of all sorts of things by the board chair, only to see that person replaced in six months by someone with very different views.

Finally, it is very difficult for any constituent group to dislodge a president who has the full confidence of the governing board. Conversely, it is difficult to retain the support of constituencies when it becomes evident to them that the board has lost confidence in the president. If you have to neglect someone or something, don't let it be your governing board.

Political aspects. I sometimes have said jokingly that I was motivated to become a college and university administrator by my desire to avoid dealing with money matters or politics. I hope you appreciate the irony expressed in that statement. Suffice it to say, there is a political aspect to the presidency that one overlooks at one's peril. Each constituent group, internal and external to the institution, has interests and expectations that the president must recognize and address. Often these conflict with one another and must be balanced.

First, establish relationships with anyone who has an interest in the institution you head. This enables you to be introduced as the new leader, and to have an opportunity to convey your values and priorities. The rewards of the relationships are reciprocal, in that you display your recognition of the interest group, conferring status by that recognition. Any interest group that believes it is worthy of a president's recognition and doesn't get it will be resentful. You will need guidance from the community relations staff as to what groups, aside from the obvious faculty, student, alumni, and donor groups, should be included. In public institutions, the governor and legislative leaders are a top priority.

In addition to establishing relationships, find consistent, nonreactive ways of communicating with important constituen-

cies—not only the board but faculty, staff, students, alumni, donors, and the like. Don't wait for problems or crises to arise. Find ways to communicate on a regular basis, reporting good news as well as how your institution is coping with problems. You can institutionalize some of this and, also, create formal mechanisms for regular contact with official leaders and governance groups. But don't forget the unofficial leaders and tribal elders. Past chairs of the faculty senate, chaired senior professors, former governors, and others are influential and will appreciate your seeking their counsel. Don't overlook their opinion-shaping power.

Additionally, make sure you have ways of obtaining feedback. Presidents can be shielded from lots of problems by well-meaning staffs and poor lines of communication with allies as well as critics. It's important to let people know that you want to hear bad news. You assume that most activities on your campus are going well; what you really need to know about are the problems that could become crises.

I include the media in this area of political relationships and communication. Being generally accessible, earning respect for your honesty, and having a staff that treats the media with respect are all important ingredients. My own experience is that the media will generally treat you and your institution fairly if you do not try to exploit them for self-promotion. They have their job to do, and their needs are not always consonant with yours.

A final word on politics. I have been called into many colleges and universities where a president has gotten into trouble, usually with faculty. As a troubleshooter, I always try to get the angry parties to help me define the precise nature of the problem and a remedy, if possible. Never is the issue that the president exceeded her or his authority; rarely is the disagreement over the president's action or view. Rather, almost always the trouble is the *way* the president has done things!

I was once called by a governing board into a conflict-laden campus where the faculty had voted "no confidence" in its president and asked the board to take action. After listening to the grievants for four days, I invited their representatives to an evening meeting with the president and the board chair, who was a former mayor of a major Eastern city. I helped explain how the disputing parties felt, and recommended a process of greater faculty consultation for the president. All agreed. At the end of this late evening, the former mayor said to me, "I could

have handled that myself. It wasn't an education issue, it was a political problem."

Budget priorities and initiatives. A new president must be mindful that the next budget request, as well as revised spending, will signal her or his priorities and values. What were the relative weights given to instruction, library expenditures, and administration? Is there no money for additional academic or instructional staff, but several new positions in the President's Office? You may not intend to send a signal, and you may resent the symbolic importance of everything you do, but that is the reality you have to work with. If you need immediate help in the President's Office, you may want to "borrow" people from other personnel lines until you have demonstrated that regularizing the positions is really necessary. It may also help to have some faculty members learn more about the administration.

Finally, many a new president has found that an expensive refurbishing of the President's House or the executive suite in the Administration Building will start an unnecessary controversy. If it really needs to be done, have the board do it before you begin your appointment.

Taking charge of everything. Most of the matters that come to your attention will be problems. My first caution, then, is, don't take charge of every problem or disagreement that arises. Don't indulge your need to show that you can be decisive, take command, and be the boss. If you originate all the solutions, then everyone else sits in judgment of you. That is not the way it is supposed to be. The president should judge the proposals of others in the institution; only the governing board should judge the proposals of the president.

Most problems fit logically within the portfolio of one of your senior administrators: academic affairs, student affairs, budget and administrative services, university relations. Using the consultative apparatus you have created, those officers should study the matter, identify alternatives, and make a recommendation to you for your consideration. True, you must decide, but you will have consulted the people who will have to implement your decision, and they will have a stake in seeing the solution succeed.

Don't take for granted that consultation has been adequate.

Ask questions to assure that key people or groups have had a chance to offer their viewpoint or perception of the facts. You may want to make some telephone calls of your own, to be able to show that you were as informed as possible before you acted.

My second caution is, don't overreact. Except for real emergencies, deal with most issues only after due study and consultation. Even those few matters that seem too urgent for the regular consultative process can usually wait 24 hours, to allow a few telephone calls and some thoughtful consideration. You may display more strength and courage by insisting on gathering the facts than by showing you have the "guts" to take action.

Managing time. A new president usually finds the first year exhausting. For one thing, every group with the remotest relationship to your college or university wants you to speak. Producing you at a party, reception, or dinner confers status on those who invited you, and invitations abound. For another, every dissident voice that failed to get satisfaction from the previous president will renew the effort with the new president.

While draining, the contact is valuable. You do want people to see you as accessible and a good listener. You do need to learn as much as possible. And you do want to become known, to meet people important to your tasks, to convey your ideas and values and make a good impression for yourself and your institution.

Try to do it all and something has to give, something important will get neglected. My admonition is that you try to manage your time fairly early in your presidency, scheduling some time to think, work on the budget, prepare an important speech, keep your family on track, visit with those who do not seek your attention and favors, and so on. Someone in your office should be able to judge the importance of the requests that come in. Some speeches can be turned down with a promise to accept an invitation next year; some requests for appointments can be referred to others. It is inevitable that a president's calendar will be filled. The question is, will others decide how it is filled or will you? Who but you will see to it that time is left for important tasks that only you can perform?

Some new presidents immerse themselves in being busy. Consumed by the calendar and by detail, they escape confronting the tasks and challenges that only a president can undertake.

Beware this trap; the consequences will soon affect your performance. Henry Mintzberg (1975) wrote of the manager's challenge to gain control of time:

> *The pressures of his job drive the manager to be superficial in his actions—to overload himself with work, encourage interruption, respond quickly to every stimulus, seek the tangible and avoid the abstract, make decisions in small increments, and do everything abruptly* (p. 60).

Living on campus. Most though not all presidencies of four-year colleges come with the expectation that the president will live in the President's House, usually on campus. Aside from the constant concern about the cost of maintaining and furnishing such residences, they are not always comfortable for a presidential family. Privacy is limited, and to justify the cost of providing such a facility most institutions try to schedule lots of activities there. Donors, board members, and others may seek to put up guests, or themselves. Presidential spouses may find taking care of such houses a full-time chore.

My view is that entertaining can be done in other campus facilities, and a generous housing allowance is preferable to living on campus in a President's House. Nevertheless, presidents usually live on campus, in such houses, and to those people I offer this advice. As soon as practicable, buy, lease, or borrow a getaway place within a few hours driving distance of the campus to remove yourself from the unreal aspects of your role—of being institutional representative and symbol. Take a break. To think or read or write or just to have a place to go that is yours. It will be good for your soul and your mental health.

Being yourself. Some people believe that you have to act in certain ways in order to be an effective president. My strong belief, based on lots of experience with many presidents, is that the best way to succeed is to be yourself. Without naming names, I can think of highly successful presidents with as diverse personalities, appearances, interests, backgrounds, and work habits as anyone can imagine. As they became known as honest, bright, candid, and respectful of the purpose of their institutions, they were able to be effective presidents. I think it natural that presidents are as diverse as our institutions. The job of president is demanding enough without thinking that you have to put on

an act. It was the character and behavior you demonstrated in your previous posts that made your new institution appoint you its president. Now is not the time to try to be a different person.

I emphasize this point because it is important that a president's self-esteem not be tied to relations with the institution's constituencies or its reputation. At the outset of this essay, I advised that you should not expect all of your efforts to be appreciated. You will be criticized. You will not be loved by everyone. To sustain yourself, you must believe that you are a decent person who is trying to do what needs to be done. A loving family will aid you in this—don't neglect them.

Leaving. I know that leaving will seem a strange topic to include in advice to new presidents. I do so because it is important to realize that a presidency is not forever. I am one of those people who see the presidency as a temporary role—a role of service for the greater good of an institution. Situations change, as do an institution's needs. There are controversies, difficult decisions, and limits to a president's energ initiatives, and ideas. Perhaps, in a few years, the majority of your governing board will have been appointed after you were selected, and the new majority may have very different views about what they want in a president.

Although some presidents stay in office 20 or more years, they are the exception; the average tenure is closer to 6 to 7 years. Some presidents go on to a second presidency but more do not. Age is a major factor. First-time presidents in their early- to mid-40s will likely have at least one if not two other positions before they retire.

Timing is important to a graceful exit. The most poignant situations I have seen are presidents in their late 50s, already in office 8 to 10 years and hoping to hold on until 65, with constituencies and board members eager for a much earlier exit. Just as performers understand that they should leave the stage with the audience still applauding for more, presidents should plan to leave while they are still highly regarded. Often only a few years separate an exit filled with applause and tributes from one embarrassing in its tone of pressure and failure. Years of good service should not end that way.

I have always tried to teach governing boards to provide presidents with graceful and dignified exits, no matter what the

circumstances. The presidency itself is vital to the institution, and it should not be demeaned. Moreover, treating outgoing presidents humanely and respectfully will help the institution attract and retain excellent presidents in the future. But a president should know when to leave and not wait to be pushed out.

Conclusion

Some may find my advice sobering if not discouraging, but I don't mean it to be anything but helpful and constructive. The college or university presidency is very important to our institutions, and through those institutions important to the quality of life in our society. Attracting good men and women to these top leadership posts is vital.

Most presidents enjoy the challenge, at least for a few years. Despite the many constraints and limitations I've described, dynamic and innovative CEOs find ways to take the initiative. The presidency is a rare opportunity to use all of one's abilities, experiences, and energies. It provides a unique sense of service and responsibility, the stewardship of which I've spoken. Anyone taking on such service and responsibility deserves our deepest respect.

References

Bensimon, Estela M., Anna Neumann, and Robert Birnbaum. 1989. *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" Word in Higher Education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Cohen, M.D., and J.G. March. 1974. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. 1984. *Presidents Make a Difference.* A report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership (Clark Kerr, chair). Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Drucker, Peter. 1966. *The Effective Executive.* New York: Harper & Row.

Mintzberg, Henry. 1975. "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact." *Harvard Business Review* 53(July/August):49–61.

Plante, Patricia. 1988. "In Support of Faculty Leadership: An Administrator's Perspective." In *Leaders for a New Era,* Madeleine F. Green, ed. New York: ACE-Macmillan.

Resource Guide

by
Sharon A. McDade

Introductory Programs For New Presidents Sponsored by Higher Education Associations

Sponsor:	**American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC)**
Title:	**Presidents Academy Workshop**
Purpose:	Explores leadership issues common to presidents, including public relations and the president's role in academic and student leadership.
Format:	Speakers, small-group discussions.
Faculty:	Presidents of member institutions and AACJC staff.
Participants:	50 participants balanced between experienced and new presidents.
Spouses:	Separate sessions, also allowed to participate in any workshop sessions.
Time of Year:	July
Length:	Five days.
Location:	Vail, CO
Contact:	Carrole Wolin, Director of Professional Development, (202) 293–7050

Sponsor:	**American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)**
Title:	**Summer Council of Presidents**
Purpose:	Focuses on getting started in the presidency and introduces AASCU. Issues addressed include networking with colleagues, setting priorities, meeting family obligations, dealing with university constituencies, and

	organizing the president's office.
Format:	Orientation session and luncheon for new presidents and spouses preceding council.
Faculty:	AASCU staff, experienced presidents of AASCU institutions.
Participants:	New presidents of member institutions.
Spouses:	Included as full members of sessions.
Time of Year:	July
Length:	New presidents: morning and lunch of first day. Council: five days.
Location:	Different resort each year.
Contact:	Christina Bitting, Director of Membership Services, (202) 293–7070

Sponsor:	**American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)**
Title:	**Workshop for New Member Presidents/Spouses**
Purpose:	Introduces new presidents to AASCU's role and purpose. Agenda varies according to current higher education issues at the time of the meeting.
Format:	Sessions preceding annual meeting.
Faculty:	AASCU staff.
Participants:	New presidents.
Spouses:	Sessions during annual meeting.
Time of Year:	Fall
Length:	Four days.
Location:	Different domestic major city each year.
Contact:	Christina Bitting, Director of Membership Services, (202) 293–7070

Sponsor:	**American Council on Education (ACE)**
Title:	**Annual Colloquium for Presidents**
Purpose:	Explores significant issues that confront beginning presidents.
Format:	Primarily interactive, such as panel discussions and small-group discussions.
Faculty:	Nationally renowned presidents.
Participants:	Primarily presidents in first, second, or third year of office. Participation is by registration and is not limited to presidents of ACE-member institutions, but there is an additional fee for nonmember presidents.
Spouses:	Spouses are encouraged to be full participants in the seminar.
Time of Year:	August
Length:	Four and one-half days.
Location:	Different resort each year.
Contact:	Marlene Ross, Associate Director, Center for Leadership Development, (202) 939–9410

Sponsor:	**American Council on Education (ACE)**
Title:	**Occasional Colloquium for Presidents**
Purpose:	Explores a specific theme relating to leadership of colleges and universities, e.g., moral leadership in higher education.
Format:	Primarily interactive, such as panel discussions and small-group discussions.
Faculty:	Nationally renowned experts on the seminar's theme principally drawn from professoriate.
Participants:	Presidents of any length of service. Participation is by registration and is not limited to presidents of ACE-member institutions, but there is an additional fee for nonmember presidents.
Spouses:	Spouses are encouraged to be full participants in the seminar.
Time of Year:	June
Length:	Four and one-half days.
Location:	Different resorts.
Contact:	Marlene Ross, Associate Director, Center for Leadership Development, (202) 939-9410

Sponsor:	**Association of American Colleges (AAC)**
Title:	**Specially designated presidential sessions at annual meeting**
Purpose:	Focuses on the cycles and seasons of presidential life—strategies for sustaining institutional momentum during difficult periods and for charting an effective course when things are going well.
Format:	Various sessions during annual meeting designated for presidents only. These include a breakfast, a hot-line response session organized around questions and problems submitted in advance by participating presidents, and presentations by college presidents and participant discussions. Each year, two or three sessions address specific topical themes, such as presidential leadership in minority achievement or developing institutional leadership.
Faculty:	Experienced presidents and scholars whose works address presidential leadership and higher education.
Participants:	Presidents of member and nonmember institutions.
Spouses:	Specific activities for spouses and partners; spouses encouraged to sit in on sessions.
Time of Year:	January
Length:	Three and one-half days.
Location:	Odd years in Washington, DC; even years in different major domestic cities.
Contact:	John W. Chandler, President, (202) 387-3760

Note:	There is a reception for new presidents during the annual meeting.
Sponsor:	**Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB)**
Title:	**Institute for Trustee Leadership: Program for Board Chairs and Chief Executive Officers of Independent Institutions**
Purpose:	Creates an opportunity for the leadership team to focus on team relationships and the way in which members can work together to strengthen the governance of the institution. By the conclusion of the program, each team will have developed a specific action plan to improve institutional governance.
Format:	Case studies, class discussions, plenary sessions, team meetings.
Faculty:	Experts on trusteeship.
Participants:	New and incumbent presidents and board chairs.
Spouses:	No programming; spouses are strongly discouraged from accompanying participants. No housing is provided for spouses.
Time of Year:	January
Length:	Three days.
Location:	Graylin Conference Center, Winston-Salem, NC
Contact:	Barbara Taylor, Director, Institute for Trustee Leadership, (202) 296–8400
Note:	The Institute is an intensive, rigorous, and intellectually stimulating exploration of institutional governance.
Sponsor:	**Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB)**
Title:	**Introduction to AGB Services (during National Conference on Trusteeship)**
Purpose:	Information session for first-time attenders of the AGB National Conference on Trusteeship, including new presidents and new trustees. Conference addresses issues of higher education.
Format:	Presentations, question-and-answer sessions, group discussion.
Faculty:	AGB staff and trustees.
Participants:	Information session: new presidents and new trustees. Conference: trustees and presidents.
Spouses:	No specific programming.
Time of Year:	Spring
Length:	Session: one hour. Convention: two and one half days.
Location:	Different domestic major city each year.
Contact:	Jacqueline E. Woods, Vice President for Programs and Public Policy, (202) 296–8400

Sponsor:	**Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)**
Title:	**Presidents' Colloquium on Institutional Advancement**
Purpose:	Brings together new and experienced presidents to examine presidential role in institutional advancement.
Format:	Lectures, class discussions, small-group discussions.
Faculty:	Presidents with extensive experience in institutional advancement and other experts.
Participants:	New and experienced presidents.
Spouses:	Programming offered during some years.
Time of Year:	January
Length:	Two days.
Location:	Different domestic city or resort.
Contact:	Mary Kay Kreft, Program Coordinator, (202) 328-5923

Sponsor:	**Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)**
Title:	**New-Presidents Workshop (preceding annual Presidents Institute)**
Purpose:	Introduces new presidents to the challenges and rewards of serving as leader of an independent institution. Explores issues such as working with trustees, fund raising, budgeting, and enrollment management.
Format:	Workshops, speeches, group discussions.
Faculty:	Experienced presidents.
Participants:	Presidents of member institutions.
Spouses:	Sessions during workshop, new presidents/spouses luncheon, sessions throughout Institute.
Time of Year:	First week of January.
Length:	Workshop: one day. Institute: Two and one-half days.
Location:	Different resort each year.
Contact:	Mary Ann F. Rehnke, Director of Annual Programs, (202) 466-7230

Sponsor:	**National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)**
Title:	**Public Policy Seminar for New Presidents**
Purpose:	Introduces new presidents to public policy and the institution's role in affecting public policy.
Format:	Briefings, speeches.
Faculty:	NAICU staff, public policy experts, government leaders.
Participants:	New presidents of any institutions, by invitation.
Spouses:	No specific programming.
Time of Year:	Fall and spring
Length:	One and one-half days.
Location:	Washington, DC
Contact:	Deborah Sykes, Coordinator of Membership Services, (202) 347-7512

Sponsor:	**National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)**
Title:	**Council of Presidents**
Purpose:	Examines the problems of succeeding in the presidency, including issues such as intercollegiate athletics, crisis management, federal and state relations, working with private institutions, working with regents and trustees, international education, and public affairs.
Format:	Speaker and discussion sessions incorporated into the Council of Presidents meetings at annual NASULGC conventions, roundtables with established presidents.
Faculty:	NASULGC staff and experienced presidents.
Participants:	Presidents of member institutions.
Spouses:	Special sessions, "Council of Presidential Spouses." For information on this council, contact Joan Coldius, (202) 778-0860.
Time of Year:	Fall
Length:	Convention: three days.
Location:	Different domestic major city each year.
Contact:	Alice Hord, Assistant to the President, (202) 778-0860
Note:	Scheduled on an as-needed basis. In 1989, the Council of Presidents meetings were incorporated into the annual meeting.

Leadership Development Programs Appropriate For New Presidents Sponsored by Associations and Institutions

Sponsor:	**American Council on Education (ACE)**
Title:	**Occasional Colloquium for Presidents**
	(See page 45.)

Sponsor:	**Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB)**
Title:	**Institute for Trustee Leadership: Program for Board Chairs and Chief Executive Officers of Independent Institutions**
	(See page 46.)

Sponsor:	**Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs**
Title:	**College Management Program**
Purpose:	Introduces administrators to the strategies of higher education management and leadership.
Format:	Class discussions, lectures, speeches, small-group discussion, role playing, simulations.
Faculty:	Scholars and practitioner experts in higher education,

leadership development, and management.

Participants: Senior-level and upper-middle-level college and university administrators.

Spouses: No specific programming.

Time of Year: Summer

Length: Three weeks.

Location: Carnegie-Mellon University

Contact: Deborah Corsini, Associate Director of Executive Programs, (412) 268-6082

Sponsor: **Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)**

Title: **Presidential and Trustee Leadership in Fund Raising**

Purpose: Explores team responsibilities in fund raising.

Format: Lectures, class discussions, small-group discussions.

Faculty: Experts in institutional advancement.

Participants: Institutional teams consisting of president, trustees, and chief development officer.

Spouses: No specific programming.

Time of Year: Spring

Length: Two days.

Location: Different domestic city or resort each year.

Contact: Mary Kay Kreft, Program Coordinator, (202) 328-5923

Sponsor: **Harvard University, Graduate School of Education**

Title: **Institute for Educational Management (IEM)**

Purpose: Develops leadership and management competencies of senior-level higher education administrators, with a specific focus on issues related to monitoring the environment, setting directions, marshalling resources and support, and managing implementation.

Format: Highly interactive, uses case study classes, small-group discussions, speakers, role playing, simulations.

Faculty: Experts in higher education, leadership development, and management drawn primarily from the faculty of Harvard University.

Participants: Presidents and senior officers of higher education organizations from the United States and abroad.

Spouses: No programming; spouses are strongly discouraged from accompanying the participants. No housing is provided for spouses.

Time of Year: Summer

Length: Four weeks.

Location: Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Contact: Sharon A. McDade, Director, (617) 495-2655

Note: Because of the rigorous, comprehensive nature of the program, participants are required to be in residence throughout the Institute.

Sponsor:	**Harvard University, Graduate School of Education**
Title:	**Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education (MLE)**
Purpose:	Focuses on the role of officers of institutions that find themselves increasingly involved in serving the needs of adults and other "nontraditional" student populations.
Format:	Case study classes, small-group discussions, speakers, role playing, simulations.
Faculty:	Experts in adult education, learning styles, and management, marketing, finance, and leadership drawn primarily from the faculty of Harvard University.
Participants:	Leaders concerned with the continuing and adult education process within colleges and universities, libraries, the military, professional associations, and the government.
Spouses:	No programming; spouses are strongly discouraged from accompanying the participant. No housing is provided for spouses.
Time of Year:	June
Length:	Two weeks.
Location:	Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Contact:	Clifford Baden, Director, (617) 495-3572
Note:	Because of the rigorous, comprehensive nature of the program, participants are required to be in residence throughout the Institute.

References

Presidents bring to their institutions vast knowledge, or they probably would not have been chosen for their jobs. Nonetheless, to succeed, every new president must acquire skills and face challenges in unfamiliar fields.

This list does not aspire to completely cover all of the resources in every field a new president may need or wish to explore. Instead, it provides a few key sources in major fields; topics specific to a particular type of institution or to a certain sector of higher education are not included. Classics, containing insights into higher education tested by time, mix with new volumes, containing the most current statistics and theories. In either case, the books are presented as places to *begin* reading only. In turn, they will introduce other authors and works.

The list was prepared in consultation with higher education experts and tested with a number of new presidents. Appreciation is extended to K. Patricia Cross, Martin Kramer, Elaine El-Khawas, and Marlene Ross and new presidents Milton F. Brown (Malcolm X College), David M. Gring (Roanoke College), Thomas C. Meredith (Western Kentucky University), Ellen Thrower (College of Insurance), Stephen L. Weber

(SUNY Oswego), and F. Sheldon Wettack (Wabash College).

See page 70 for the addresses of selected publishers.

Bibliographies

These annotated bibliographies, all organized by nomenclatures of topics, offer the fastest access to leading publications in a wide variety of higher education, leadership, and management fields. The Jossey-Bass volumes even star the most important publications in each area. Just reading through the annotations provides a useful way of identifying the key authors in a field, the salient issues, and the vocabulary—useful information when a president must become an instant expert.

For all the bibliographies below, resources were chosen by experts in each field; each citation is annotated; and each chapter opens with an introduction on the field.

Cohen, Arthur M., James C. Palmer, and K. Diane Zwemer. 1986. *Key Resources on Community Colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Useful introduction establishes trends and issues.

Halstead, Kent (ed.). Annual since 1987. *Higher Education Bibliography Yearbook*. Washington, DC: Research Associates of Washington.

Halstead, Kent (ed.). 1981. *Higher Education: A Bibliographic Handbook*. (2 volumes) Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and the National Institute of Education.

Menges, Robert J., and B. Claude Mathis. 1988. *Key Resources on Teaching, Learning, Curriculum, and Faculty Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Useful introduction establishes trends and issues.

Peterson, Marvin W., and Lisa A. Mets (eds.). 1987. *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management, and Leadership: A Guide to the Literature*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Useful introduction establishes trends and issues.

Rowland, A. Westley (ed.). 1987. *Key Resources on Institutional Advancement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Useful introduction establishes trends and issues.

See also, Kerr and Gade under **Presidential Leadership** heading.

The Resource Shelf

A shelf of basic higher education reference books close at hand can be very helpful for just the right statistics to prove a point or the precise phone number to provide information and advice.

American Council on Education. Annual. *Higher Education Today: Facts in Brief.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Short, with graphs and bullets. Overviews pertinent higher education facts.

Bloland, Harland G. 1985. *Associations in Action: The Washington, DC, Higher Education Community.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Overview of the world of higher education associations in Washington, DC, focusing on the "big six." Includes observations on their missions and ways in which institutions can best use their memberships and services.

Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning. Bimonthly. Washington, DC: Heldref Publications.

Second-most-read publication in higher education after *The Chronicle.* Articles on current issues and problems of higher education. Usually a special feature article and three to four others. Also includes editorials, a brief and very readable statistical analysis of an education problem, and book reviews. Frequent theme issues explore a topic in depth.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. Weekly. Washington, DC: The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

Weekly newspaper with the highest circulation of any higher education publication. Special sections cover research notes; philanthropy; gazette of appointments, resignations, and deaths; "bulletin board" listing of available jobs; calendar of upcoming events; and ads for services, conferences, workshops, and calls for papers.

Higher Education & National Affairs (HENA). Semimonthly. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Newsletter providing timely information on federal issues and national education trends. News features, as well as an in-depth feature, an opinion piece by a higher education leader, and handy statistics on topics such as the decline of high school graduates.

Marchese, Theodore J. 1987. *The Search Committee Handbook: A Guide to Recruiting Administrators.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Step-by-step guide through the mine field of hiring administrators: the organizational opportunity inherent in a vacancy; using search firms and consultants; the composition, charge, and ground rules for the search committee; identifying qualifications for the job; recruiting a candidate pool; identifying

talent among applications; knowing and courting candidates; and bringing a new person on board.

McGuinness, Aims C. 1986. *State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook: 1986*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Gold mine of information on state higher education structures, agencies, offices, and administrators. Tables of data, as well as summaries on changes in statewide structures and statewide education planning.

Office of Minority Concerns. Annual. *Minorities in Higher Education: Annual Status Report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Overview of information on minority students. Introductory essay establishes current themes and issues, followed by tables on minority high school graduation and college enrollment rates, degrees conferred, and minorities in the teaching force. Also briefly addresses specific minority issues, such as the status of the *Adams* case and the teacher education reform movement.

Ottinger, Cecilia (ed.). Updated biennially. *The Fact Book on Higher Education*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Probably the single most useful source for higher education data. Includes population and demographic statistics, institutional characteristics and historical data, earned degree data, financial statistics, faculty characteristics, and enrollment data.

Torregrosa, Constance Healey (ed.). Updated annually. *The HEP Higher Education Directory*. Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publications, Inc.

Information bible of higher education. Includes information on every accredited institution in the United States, Puerto Rico, and U.S. territories, including address, phone number, and names of key officers. Lists accrediting agencies (and their acronyms), statewide agencies, associations, and consortia, as well as institutional changes (openings, closings, and name changes) of the past year. Indexed by both administrator's name and institution.

Note: Many state and regional organizations publish excellent factbooks.

Handy Information

Assuming a presidency means facing an entirely new set of challenges, ranging from the basic (e.g., housing) to the ethical. These booklets of handy information are available f.. ' higher education associations, indicating the support that such organizations can provide.

AASCU. 1988. *Ethical Practices for College Presidents.* Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Defines ethical responsibilities of presidents, suggesting standards of presidential conduct.

AASCU. 1989. *Responsibilities and Rights of College Presidents.* Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Defines major responsibilities and rights necessary to undertake institutional goals. Discusses appropriate roles and relationships of the president and governing board.

CASE. 1988. *Planning a Presidential Inauguration.* A CASE Answer File. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Includes suggestions for avoiding pitfalls and a time line for planning activities.

Wellen, Robert H., and Howard Clemons. 1987. *Presidential Housing and Tax Reform.* Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Guidelines for presidents and their attorneys on qualifying for the tax exclusion for college-provided housing.

Higher Education and Leadership Issues

A new president is likely to encounter the entire range of issues facing higher education within the first months on the job. The following key resources on the major ones were chosen for their ability to outline a range of topics on a particular issue, their seminal value in the delineation of an issue, their relevance to the challenges and problems of a new president, or their specific advice for new presidents.

Athletics and the NCAA

"Academic Integrity and Athletic Eligibility." 1981. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Useful guidelines from ACE's Office on Self-Regulation Initiatives.

"Collegiate Athletic Policy Statements." 1979. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Basic policy statement adaptable for any institution from ACE's Office on Self-Regulation Initiatives.

Oliva, L. Jay. 1989. *What Trustees Should Know About Intercollegiate Athletics.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Basic overview of the issues.

"Student Athlete Drug Testing Programs." 1986. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Resource document for institutions from ACE's Office on Self-Regulation Initiatives.

Curriculum

Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Many scholars point out substantial errors of data; others argue with the premise and conclusions. Nonetheless, a seminal work in the discussion of higher education curricula if only because of the popular controversy it created. Based on an analysis of the intellectual themes in curricula of this century, Bloom indicts American higher education for providing primarily for the economic comfort and careers of students rather than for their need to understand the past to create a vision of the future.

Boyer, Ernest. 1987. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Based on research at 30 institutions. Investigation of the collegiate mission, academic programs, campus life, and the transition from college to work, with recommendations for change. Critique of today's undergraduate education that will be helpful in dealing with the ramifications of the current educational reform movement.

Levine, Arthur. 1978. *Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Comprehensive, two-volume discussion of all aspects of curriculum, including definition, history, analysis of current state, criticisms, and proposals for undergraduate curricula. Brings together information from many sources, including a comparative and historical perspective on undergraduate curricula and a listing of important events in the development of American curricula.

Rudolph, Frederick. 1977. *A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thorough study of the evolution of curriculum in American colleges and universities. Frame of reference for understanding the roots of today's curricula, as well as a useful discussion of the meaning of *curriculum.*

Economy and Higher Education

Leslie, Larry L., and Paul T. Brinkman. 1988. *The Economic Value of Higher Education.* New York: American Council on Education/

Macmillan.

What is the economic value of education and how can that value be measured? Critiques assessment methods; summarizes data on the contributions of higher education to the local and national economies; and examines the relationship of tuition, financial aid, and enrollment. Extensive bibliography of studies on the economics of higher education.

SRI International. 1986. *The Higher Education-Economic Development Connection*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Explores the role of colleges and universities in the economic development of communities, states, and the nation. Building from actual examples, shows the variety of roles available to institutions and the strategies that can be employed for institutional effectiveness.

Financial Management and Control

Dickmeyer, Nathan, and K. Scott Hughes. 1982. *Financial Self-Assessment: A Workbook for Colleges*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Readable workbook for assessing the financial health of a college or university, including step-by-step directions, worksheets, clear definitions, and notes for interpreting results. Especially helpful for presidents *before* they enter office as a mechanism for gathering pertinent financial information and for applying indicators to determine the institution's financial strengths and weaknesses.

Hyatt, James A. *A Cost Accounting Handbook for Colleges and Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Basic concepts of financial management, with many examples, worksheets, and explanations. Covers cost accounting, and then investigates financial management issues for four program areas. Excellent resource for the new president who needs a quick but thorough introduction to financial management.

Kaludis, George. 1973. *Strategies for Budgeting*. New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Concentrates on the strategies of budgeting and their implications for institutions, rather than numbers. Uses institutional examples to explain formula budgeting and the differences between fiscal, financial, and academic plans. Although examples may be a bit dated, the lessons are still appropriate.

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. 1982. *Ratio Analysis in Higher Education*, 2nd ed. New York: Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

Brief but thorough introduction to ratio analysis, basic fund accounting, financial reporting, and evaluation of financial performance. Booklet includes sample balance sheets and financial reports, sample ratio calculations and analysis of their meanings, and an essay on how ratio analysis can be integrated into long-term planning for financial health. Data tables of the range of ratios for types of institutions.

Governance and Government (Federal and State, and the Law)

Gladieux, Lawrence E., and Gwendolyn Lewis. 1987. *The Federal Government and Higher Education: Traditions, Trends, Stakes, and Issues.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Brief background on the roles of the state and federal governments with useful comparative statistics. Booklet introduces the perennial issues of the government/higher education relationship and describes barometers of that relationship.

Goodall, Leonard (ed.). 1987. *When Colleges Lobby States: The Higher Education/State Government Connection*. Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Essays on the basic yet controversial issues that link colleges and universities to state governments, with an overview of the mechanisms of college participation in state politics. Topics include accountability, autonomy, lobbying, budgeting, multi-campus systems, presidential leadership, tuition policy, state boards, president-government interactions, and forms of financial support.

Hines, Edward R. 1988. *Higher Education and State Governments: Renewed Partnership, Cooperation, or Competition?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Explores the issues and relationships binding state government and higher education, including state leadership, support, and policies as well as accountability, autonomy, and regulation. Discusses the role of the state higher education agency, trustees, governing boards, the multi-campus system, governors, and lobbying agencies.

Hobbs, Walter C. (ed.). 1978. *Government Regulation of Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Solid background on the evolution and impact of government regulation. Essays examine basic regulations from a variety of viewpoints and address the reasons for increased regulations,

including issues of institutional fairness and sensitivity to previously neglected individuals. A bit dated, but solid background to understand history of today's government regulation.

Jung, Steven M. 1986. *The Role of Accreditation in Directly Improving Educational Quality*. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Monograph from COPA, the association of accrediting associations. Introduces accreditation as a mechanism for institutional improvement. Describes critical moments when institutions can benefit from the accreditation process and demonstrates the usefulness of these interchanges through several case studies. Useful for the new president anticipating an accreditation review.

Kaplin, William A. 1985. *The Law of Higher Education: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Comprehensive summary of legal issues facing colleges and universities. Reviews legal issues related to faculty, students, administrators, staff, and trustees; analyzes federal and state regulations; describes important court cases; and explains the legal relationship of institutions and accrediting associations. Very readable for nonlawyers.

Higher Education (History, Issues, and Reflection)

Bok, Derek. 1982. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibility of the Modern University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Discusses the responsibilities of colleges and universities to address the problems of society. Deals with issues of maintaining institutional independence and objectivity while responding to moral and societal problems and the increasingly complex expectations society has of higher education.

Bowen, Howard R. 1977. *Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Does the return on the investment in education equal its costs? Important sourcebook on the facts and judgments about the outcomes of higher education. Introduces much of the vocabulary and arguments used today to discuss the value and assessment of education.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. 1968. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co.

A classic sociological and historical analysis of the evolution of higher education and its institutions. Its central thrust is an

examination of the rise of the faculty to a central position of power within academia.

Kerr, Clark. 1982. *The Uses of the University*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, former president of the UC system, analyzes the many societal, economic, cultural, and scholarly impacts on the major research university. Introduces *multiversity* to describe the major research university and its responsibilities to multiple constituencies. The 1982 edition includes notes by Kerr on what has happened to universities since the first edition, published in 1972.

Lynton, Ernest A., and Sandra E. Elman. 1987. *New Priorities for the University*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Authors argue that changing conditions demand new priorities and suggest ways that policies, procedures, and structures can change to meet them. Examination of the mission of modern universities, educational needs of a knowledge society, and preparation that faculty will need to meet these new challenges.

Riesman, David. 1981. *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Examines the current environment in which presidents function. Riesman argues that colleges and universities are no longer faculty-dominated, with an ethos of academic merit, but student-dominated, with an emphasis on student consumerism.

Institutional Advancement, Alumni Relations, and Fund Raising

Fisher, James L. 1980. *Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities*. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 8. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Examines the many roles that presidents must play in institutional advancement, including chief strategist, definer, and planner. Covers the role of the president in public relations, alumni stewardship, fund raising, and government relations.

Pray, Francis C. (ed.). 1981. *Handbook on Educational Fund Raising: A Guide to Successful Principles and Practices for Colleges, Universities, and Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Detailed analysis of the steps of successful fund raising, including annual giving and associates programs, capital campaigns and major gifts, corporate support, other giving constituencies, volunteers, involvement of other campus administrators, and criteria for operational efficiency. Although written for the fund-raising executive, provides a background for the uninitiated president.

Rowland, A. Westley (ed.). 1986. *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Examines institutional advancement, defined as "all those programs and activities undertaken by a college or university to develop understanding and support from all its publics for its educational goals." Examines institutional relations, fund raising, alumni administration, government relations, publications, and executive management. Written for the advancement executive, useful for providing the questions presidents ought to be asking their institutional advancement staff.

Leadership (General Issues in Higher Education)

Bennis, Warren. 1989. *Why Leaders Can't Lead*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ought to be read before one becomes an example suitable for the book. Bennis, one of the most perceptive writers on leadership, explores the conspiracies and obstacles that render leaders ineffective and offers strategies to combat these negative forces.

Bensimon, Estela M., Anna Neumann, and Robert Birnbaum. 1989. *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" Word in Higher Education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Synthesis of the major literature on leadership and administration, bringing clarity to the important leadership models and theories. Useful to the new president trying to understand his/her leadership style in a new context.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1992. *How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Applies organizational theory and psychology to colleges and universities. Presents several models to explain how organizations function and then integrates these into a flexible model that Birnbaum argues provides a new way of thinking about leadership.

Burns, James M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

By the father of "transformational leadership." Examines the accomplishments of leaders who made major contributions and changes in history and culture to provide a philosophical concept for leadership. Although Burns addresses leadership on a more global scale than typically experienced by college presidents, his book is useful to the new president trying to define a personal purpose and style.

Fisher, James L., Martha W. Tack, and Karen J. Wheeler. 1988. *The*

Effective College President. New York: American Council on Education/ Macmillan.

Based on a survey of presidents. Identifies the personal characteristics, professional backgrounds, and attitudinal differences of those presidents deemed the most effective by their peers. Presents lessons for leadership effectiveness.

Green, Madeleine F. (ed.). 1988. *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education*. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Overviews the changes that have created new roles for leaders. Sets the stage for practical suggestions for identifying, developing, and selecting successful leaders. Includes information, advice, and encouragement needed to spearhead improvement in leadership quality.

McDade, Sharon A. 1987. *Higher Education Leadership: Enhancing Skills Through Professional Development Programs*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Overviews the leadership development programs available to higher education administrators. Explores the benefits and problems of participation, and personal and institutional strategies for using professional development programming. Its list of programs and their addresses is particularly useful for the planning of professional development throughout the presidency.

Management and Organizations (General Issues)

Bolman, L. Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 1986. *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Looks at organizations through four "frames" of management: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. Explains basic organizational behavior theories and research, and how to apply each frame to the management of organizations. Explores leadership styles. Frames provide a useful mechanism to understand the organization into which a new president is now immersed.

Chaffee, Ellen Earle, and William G. Tierney. 1988. *Collegiate Culture and Leadership Strategies*. New York: American Council on Education/ Macmillan.

Casebook featuring stories of seven distinctly different academic and organizational cultures that helps readers to experience organizations not their own. From these observations grow implications for successful academic leadership.

Deal, Terrence E., and Allan A. Kennedy. 1982. *Corporate Cultures*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Explores the components of organizational culture that influence success, types of culture, the essence of corporate heroes, the values at the core of culture, and the rites and rituals that identify culture in action. Useful for the president trying to understand the culture of a new institution.

Keller, George. 1983. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Still the best overview of institutional planning as a function of leadership. Examines the process of strategic planning, including the importance of preplanning activities, information gathering, assessment, and the adaptation of process to the culture of each institution.

Millet, John D. 1980. *Management, Governance, and Leadership: A Guide for College and University Administrators*. New York: AMACOM (a division of American Management Association).

Discusses how management, leadership, and governance differ. Of particular interest is Millet's advice on organizing the office of the president to provide the consultation and feedback necessary for success.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and John E. Corbally (eds.). 1984. *Leadership and Organizational Culture: New Perspectives on Administrative Theory and Practice*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Higher education application of the concepts of organizational culture. Particularly focuses on the challenges of exerting leadership in loosely structured organizations such as colleges and universities.

Presidential Evaluation

AASCU. 1988. "Evaluating College and University Presidents." Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Guidelines on how and how not to evaluate college presidents.

Nason, John W. 1984. *Presidential Assessment: A Guide to the Periodic Review of the Performance of Chief Executives*, rev. ed. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Although written for boards of trustees, offers practical guidance to the president on the review of responsibilities and performance. Includes guidelines and sample forms.

Seldin, Peter. 1988. *Evaluating and Developing Administrative*

Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

A primer to the issues and processes of administrative evaluation. Addresses problems of overcoming natural reluctance to evaluate, setting up a fair program, and using evaluation decisions to make personnel decisions and improve administrator performance.

Presidential Overview

Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March. 1986. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. 2nd ed. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Classic higher education book sharing insights from a survey on the careers of college and university presidents. Its greatest contribution is the concept of the university as an "organized anarchy" in which presidents can make little impact. Paperback edition contains a new preface and other commentaries by the authors that update their research and reflections.

Gilmore, Thomas North. 1988. *Making A Leadership Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Addresses the many phases of a leadership transition. Of greatest interest are the sections on how new leaders can take charge effectively, what they must do to succeed over time, and what they can do to build an effective management team.

Fisher, James L. 1984. *Power of the Presidency*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Analyzes the types of power—coercive, reward, expert, legitimate, and charismatic—that presidents can use to accomplish objectives. Concentrates on knowing when, where, why, and how to use them. Also helpful and often humorous tips for success. A controversial treatise on power and the presidency.

Kauffman, Joseph F. 1980. *At the Pleasure of the Board: The Service of the College and University President*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

One of the best descriptions of the problems, challenges, and opportunities of the college presidency. Emphasizes "service" as a major responsibility.

Kerr, Clark. 1984. *Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Ostensibly for trustees, the results of this three-year study provide equal sustenance for presidents. Through a series of recommendations and suggested actions, covers topics of trustee support, presidential review, determining how long to stay (and

when to leave), and governance issues.

Kerr, Clark, and Marian Gade. 1986. *The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place & Character.* Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Comprehensive study of the academic presidency and those who fill it. Sequel to *Presidents Make a Difference.* Examines the reality of decision making in higher education and the impact of leadership on a college campus. Sections on the relevance of power and influence are particularly useful. Annotated bibliography of books on higher education leadership and governance.

Presidential Reflections

Berendzen, Richard. 1986. *Is My Armor on Straight? A Year in the Life of a University President.* Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler.

Day-by-day and sometimes detail-by-detail account of the academic year 1983–1984 as experienced by the president of American University. Particularly successful in painting the variety, conflicts, and stresses of the job.

Fisher, James L., and Judith W. Tack (eds.). 1988. *Leaders on Leadership: The College Presidency.* New Directions for Higher Education, No. 61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sourcebook of essays by 18 presidents dispatching solid and practical advice on the problems and issues of higher education as well as significant insight into the leadership styles and attitudes of some of today's higher education leaders.

Hesburgh, Theodore M. 1979. *The Hesburgh Papers.* Kansas City, MO: Andrews and McMeel.

Reflective essays by the long-time president of Notre Dame University on issues of higher education, religion, and world affairs. "The University President" is particularly relevant, containing the advice his predecessor gave him when Hesburgh became president.

Killian, James R., Jr. 1985. *The Education of a College President: A Memoir.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Memoir by the former president of MIT. Valuable for new presidents for the insight it offers on the development of a process of orderly transition between presidents.

Sammartino, Peter. 1982. *The President of a Small College.* New York: Cornwall Books.

Practical advice on running a small college from the chancellor of Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Speeches and Speechmaking

Note: Most bookstores stock a variety of books on the techniques of speechmaking.

Clifton, Fadine (ed.). 1985. *The Little, Brown Book of Anecdotes.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown Co.

A well-indexed compendium of useful anecdotes to punctuate a point in a speech. Organized by source.

Fitzhenry, Robert I. (ed.). 1986. *The Barnes & Noble Book of Quotations.* New York: Barnes & Noble.

Arranged by topic.

Peter, Lawrence J. 1977. *Peter's Quotations: Ideas for Our Times.* New York: Bantam Books.

Gems of brevity collected by the author of *The Peter Principle.* Humorous, crisp, and witty. Includes pop culture and recent people. Arranged by topic.

Prochnow, Herbert V., and Herbert V. Prochnow, Jr. *The Public Speaker's Treasure Chest: A Compendium of Source Material to Make Your Speech Sparkle,* 4th ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Extensive listing of quotations and anecdotes. Chapters on preparing speeches and tips on improving your speech.

Webster's New World Dictionary of Quotable Definitions. 1988. New York: Prentice-Hall.

The classic quotes.

Spouses

Clodius, Joan E., and Diane Skomars Magrath (eds.). 1984. *The President's Spouse: Volunteer or Volunteered?* Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Essays by 13 spouses on the difficulties, needs, and expectations of the "job," including information from a survey of the spouses of presidents and chancellors of NASULGC institutions.

Corbally, Marguerite Walker. 1977. *The Partners: Sharing the Life of a College President.* Danville, IL: Interstate.

One of the first books to draw attention to the special role, challenges, and problems of the presidential spouse. Draws on information from a survey of spouses and on personal experience at the University of Illinois.

Ostar, Roberta H. 1983. *Myths and Realities: 1983 Report on the AASCU Presidential Spouses.* Washington, DC: American Association of State

Colleges and Universities.

Results of the second AASCU survey of presidential spouses. Insights for the president and partner on dual careers, living conditions, the role of the spouse in institutional activities, institutional support for the spouse and the role, and attitudes of spouses.

Students

ACE and ECS. 1988. *One-Third of a Nation: A Report of the Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

A challenge to American society, government, and higher education to raise minority citizens to full participation in American life. Concise prose and strong graphics present a chilling picture of lost ground and neglect, followed by goals and strategies for improvement.

Astin, Alexander W., Kenneth C. Green, and William S. Korn. 1987. *The American Freshman: Twenty Year Trends.* Los Angeles: Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California.

Reports survey responses of some six million students to questions on academic skills, high school, political and social attitudes, personal goals, and plans for college and careers. Summary chapter followed by approximately 75 pages of normative data.

Chickering, Arthur W., and Associates. 1981. *The Modern American College: Responding to the New Realities of Diverse Students and a Changing Society.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Comprehensive volume of essays by a "who's who" of scholars in the fields of teaching, students, and curriculum. Addresses topics of today's students and their needs, implications of curricula, and the effects of teaching, student services, and administration. An important resource for institutions involved with lifelong education, a concept the authors argue to be the probable direction for higher education in the future.

Fleming, Jacqueline. 1984. *Blacks in College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reports on a four-year research project that examined assumptions about how intellectual development is achieved, and then tests these assumptions for black and white students. Examines education for blacks in various types of educational institutions and environments.

Garland, Peter H. 1985. *Serving More Than Students: A Critical Need for College Student Personnel Services.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education

Report No. 7. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

The role of a student affairs administrator is evolving from disciplinarian and custodian to full member of the leadership team. Examines the new role of student affairs within the university with commentary on the changes in students, institutional strategies, and student personnel roles and their implications for programs, services, and professional skills.

Green, Madeleine F. (ed.). 1989. *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Easy-to-read and easy-to-use handbook to shape consideration of campus diversity. Chapter on conducting an institutional audit will be a helpful guide for gathering information on institutional policies, procedures, and data on student diversity. Others provide commentary and strategies on ways to enhance diversity among students, faculty, and administrators and address campus climate and teaching, learning, and the curriculum.

Olivas, Michael A. (ed.). 1986. *Latino College Students.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Essays from a social science perspective on the Hispanic student in high school, in the transition to college, and in college. Also addresses issues of Latino student achievement, economics, and stratification. First book-length treatment of the Hispanic college student.

Pearson, Carol S., Donna L. Shavlik, and Judith G. Touchton. 1988. *Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Begins with the premise that "if an institution were to commit itself fully to meeting the educational needs of women, what would it do?" Addresses women's diversity and commonalities, learning environments shaped by women, the ways we think and teach, and the needs and structures to transform the institution.

"Race, Racism, and American Education: Perspectives of Asian Americans, Blacks, Latinos, and Native Americans." August 1988. *Harvard Educational Review.* Cambridge, MA: President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Special issue discussing the "historical and contemporary effects of racism in the United States," written by scholars "who are members of the groups most affected by racism" (p. vi). Topics include racial inequality, the power of pedagogy in reinforcing racism, discrimination, empowerment, and prejudice.

"Student Aid: The High Cost of Living on Credit." May/June 1986. *Change, The Magazine of Higher Learning*. Washington, DC: Heldref Publications.

Special issue devoted to changes in patterns of how students pay for college and the implications of the changes for students, their families, colleges and universities, and American society. Excellent introduction to the debates of student financial aid.

Teaching and Learning Issues

Blackburn, Robert T., *et.al.* 1986. *Faculty as a Key Resource: A Review of the Research Literature*. Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTAL), University of Michigan.

Short monograph surveying the literature and research. Covers historical perspective and issues of faculty at work and as teachers, their functioning within organizations, and evaluation. Extensive bibliography on issues of faculty, teaching, and learning.

Claxton, Charles S., and Patricia H. Murrell. 1987. *Learning Styles: Implications for Improving Education Practices*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Solid review of the literature on learning styles. Describes the major theories of learning and the historical development of the field. Of greatest use are its introduction to the vocabulary and major typology of learning styles, chapters on the implications of the research for student affairs, the work environment, and pedagogy, especially for minority and nontraditional students.

Eble, Kenneth E. 1985. *The Aims of College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Considers how teaching affects students and the value of knowledge. Beyond its discussion of topics such as the style and character of teaching, considers the greater aims of education and their evolution over the past two decades.

Finkelstein, Martin J. (ed.). 1985. *ASHE Reader on Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities*. Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

Eclectic overview of issues regarding faculty, including current status of the professoriate, careers, culture, work environment, development, and evaluation. Essays, written by scholars, reprinted from journals, books, and reports. Each section has an extensive bibliography. Good and quick way to survey the issues before stepping too far into the academic quagmire.

Trustees

AASCU. 1988. *The President and the Governing Board: Conditions for Effective Leadership*. Washington, DC: American Association for State Colleges and Universities.

Outlines major responsibilities and rights of the president necessary for effective leadership of institutional goals. Discusses the roles and relationships of the governing board and president.

Ingram, Richard T., and Associates. 1980. *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thoroughly investigates higher education trusteeship. An indispensable resource for presidents and board members alike. Twenty chapters cover responsibilities, policies, practices, stewardship, fund raising, oversight, performance evaluation, and effective board operations. Includes practical assistance such as model bylaws, a trustee audit, and a self-study format.

Nason, John. 1982. *The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibility of College and University Boards*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

The classic on the responsibilities of college and university trustees. Includes practical advice for board effectiveness and criteria for evaluation of board performance.

Taylor, Barbara E. 1987. *Working Effectively With Trustees: Building Cooperative Campus Leadership*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Does the unusual and examines the board from the perspective of the president. Particularly valuable for its insights on how administrators and faculty can share authority with trustees.

Zwingle, J.L. 1984. *Effective Trusteeship*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Considered by many to be the best introduction to the duties of trustees collectively and individually. Useful sections on board organization, bylaws, agendas, and evaluation.

Publisher Addresses

Adler & Adler, 4550 Montgomery Ave., Suite 705, Bethesda, MD 20814.

American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036.

American Association for State Colleges and Universities (AASCU),

One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

American Association for State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) Press, 4720-A Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706.

American Council on Education (ACE), One Dupont Circle, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036.

American Council on Education/Macmillan Series on Higher Education, Macmillan Publishing Co., 866 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

AMACOM, 135 West 50th St., New York, NY 10020.

Andrews and McMeel, 4900 Main St., Kansas City, MO 64112.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036.

Ballinger, 54 Church St., Cambridge, MA 02138.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc., 1255 23rd St. NW, Washington, DC 20037.

College Board Publications, PO Box 886, New York, NY 10101.

Cornwall Books, 440 Forsgate Dr., Cranbury, NJ 08512.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), Eleven Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036.

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, One Dupont Circle, Suite 305, Washington, DC 20036.

Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80295.

ERIC-ASHE Higher Education Reports, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036.

Ginn Press, 191 Spring St., Lexington, MA 02173.

Harvard Business School Press, Morgan 41, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston, MA 02163.

Harvard Educational Review, Harvard University, Graduate School

of Education, Gutman Library, Third Floor, Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Harvard University Press, Harvard University, Kittridge Hall, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Higher Education Publications, Inc., 2946 Sleepy Hollow Rd., Falls Church, VA 22044.

Interstate, PO Box 50, Danville, IL 61834.

The Johns Hopkins University Press, 701 West 40th St., Suite 275, Baltimore, MD 21211.

Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc., 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94104-1310.

MIT Press, 55 Hayward, Cambridge, MA 02139.

National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), One Dupont Circle, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), One Dupont Circle, Suite 710, Washington, DC 20036.

National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTAL), University of Michigan, 610 East University Ave., School of Education Bldg., Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259.

Peat Marwick Main & Co., Distribution Center, 3 Chestnut Ridge Rd., Montvale, NJ 07645-0435.

Step Up, Inc., 2 Spanish St. Ct., Cape Girardeau, MO 63701.

Teachers College Press, Harper & Row, Keystone Industrial Park, Scranton, PA 18512.

University of Chicago Press, 5801 Ellis Ave., Fourth Floor, Chicago, IL 60637.

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

One Dupont Circle, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 293-6440, Fax (202) 293-0073

80